

New Series

Volume I, Number 2

April 1950

The Review of English Studies

*A Quarterly Journal of
English Literature and the English Language*

Editor

JOHN BUTT, B.LITT., M.A.

Secretary

JANET HESELTINE

CONTENTS

- The Tragic Conflict in *Hamlet*. By J. J. Lawlor 97
Coriolanus, Aristotle, and Bacon. By F. N. Lees
The Source of *The Emperour of the East*. By J. E. Gray
The Game of Ombre in *The Rape of the Lock*. By W. K. Wimsatt, Jr. 136

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

- A Seventeenth-century Guide to Character Writing (B. L. Joseph) . 144
The Reading Public in 1803 (R. W. Chapman)
Arnold and Johnson (Kathleen Tillotson)
The British Quarterly Review (R. V. Osbourn) 147

(Continued at foot of next page)

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 8/6 net. Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 30/-

The Review of English Studies

Advisory Panel: H. S. BENNETT, M.A.; SIR EDMUND CHAMBERS, K.B.E., D.Litt., F.B.A.; R. W. CHAPMAN, D.Litt., LL.D.; H. B. CHARLTON, M.A., D. de Dijon, Litt.D.; UNA M. ELLIS-FERMOR, B.Litt., M.A., D.Lit.; B. IFOR EVANS, M.A., D.Lit.; DOROTHY EVERETT, M.A.; W. W. GREG, Litt.D., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A.; SIR HERBERT GRIERSON, LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A.; EDITH J. MORLEY, M.A.; ALLARDYCE NICOLL, M.A.; A. W. REED, D.Lit.; PERCY SIMPSON, M.A., D.Litt.; KENNETH SISAM, M.A., F.B.A.; D. NICHOL SMITH, LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.; JAMES R. SUTHERLAND, M.A., B.Litt.; ALICE WALKER, D.Litt.; F. P. WILSON, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A.; J. DOVER WILSON, C.H., Litt.D., F.B.A.; C. L. WRENN, M.A.

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editor, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o Clarendon Press, Oxford. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publisher: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

CONTENTS (*continued*)

REVIEWS, ETC.: The Later Genesis, ed. from MS. Junius II by B. J. Timmer, 153; Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century, by H. S. Bennett, 155; Chaucer's World, compiled by Edith Rickert, ed. C. C. Olson and M. M. Crow, 156; The Harley Lyrics: The Middle English Lyrics of MS. Harley 2253, ed. G. L. Brook, 158; Essays on Primitivism and Related Ideas in the Middle Ages, by George Boas, 159; Shakespearian Tragedy, by H. B. Charlton, 163; Shakespeare the Dramatist, by U. Ellis-Fermor, 163; A Notebook on William Shakespeare, by Edith Sitwell, 163; The Satiric and the Didactic in Ben Jonson's Comedy, by Helena Watts Baum, 166; Rhetoric as a Dramatic Language in Ben Jonson, by A. H. Sackton, 166; English Emblem Books, by Rosemary Freeman, 168; John Bunyan: L'Homme et L'Œuvre, par H. A. Talon, 170; A Bibliography of Horace Walpole, by A. T. Hazen, 172; John Hales of Eton, by J. H. Elson, 174; A Preface to Eighteenth Century Poetry, by J. Sutherland, 175; George Eliot. Her Mind and Her Art, by Joan Bennett, 177; The Notebooks of Henry James, ed. F. O. Matthiessen and K. B. Murdock, 179; The Art of Fiction and other Essays by Henry James, (introd.) M. Roberts, 179; Taste and Technique in Book-collecting, by J. Carter, 183; Short Notices, 184; Summary of Periodical Literature, by A. Macdonald, 186; List of publications received, 191.



Vo

N

for
eff
aw
the
pla
aw
an
illu
tru
Ot
ten
cas
con
de
en
the
are
tha
cri
syn
Na
ful
tha
it
the

fro

R

The Review of English Studies

VOL. I, NEW SERIES, NO. 2

APRIL 1950

THE TRAGIC CONFLICT IN *HAMLET*

By J. J. LAWLOR

MY present intention is to ask again an old question, Why does Hamlet delay his revenge? Considerations of space forbid my giving reasons for supposing that this is a question which can profitably be asked. The effect of some recent criticism of Shakespeare has been to turn attention away from questions of character and motive to matters of theatrecraft and the 'dramatic illusion'; we are recommended, above all, to consider the plays as poetry. But, however much we welcome the modern movement away from a thorough-going psychological naturalism, it is surely to fly to an extreme to refuse *in toto* the conception of 'character'. The dramatic illusion aims at convincing us of the reality of the persons represented, their truth to substantial human nature. We assent to the existence of Hamlet, Othello, Lear, and Macbeth as to the existence of any of the great 'characters' of naturalistic fiction. The *means* employed to that end are in the two cases totally distinct—and it is here, with the heightened perception that comes with attention to the plays as Elizabethan drama, that we record our debt to modern criticism. But in play and novel alike the artist's immediate end (and necessary condition of success) is the same—to win our assent to the real existence and momentous fate of persons who in their own kind are but shadows. Again, though it will be evident, I trust, in what follows that I hold *Hamlet* to be a masterpiece, yet I have attempted no detailed critique of the positions that it is wholly or in part failure. A working synthesis of the two prevalent schools of Shakespeare criticism—the Naturalistic and the 'Realist'—is urgently necessary, but must receive fuller treatment than can be here attempted. In what follows I shall assume that the problem of Hamlet's delay is valid for critical inquiry; and I hope it may appear that an understanding of this delay is ground for assessing the play as a masterpiece.

Let me put the problem in its simplest form. Hamlet delays because, from the outset of the play, his is palpably a nature that cannot enact the

deed demanded of it. In his aversion from that deed he calls in question all things under the sun, and contemplates with longing an end of his wearied life. Nowhere does he give us any one, unmistakable reason for his delay. I believe most critics would assent, no doubt with varying emphasis, to these propositions. But, here is the difficulty—how is the Elizabethan audience to apprehend this? We have seen no such lavish portrayal and analysis of human nature in any Elizabethan play, nor does the Elizabethan theatrical tradition lend itself to this treatment. Great critics have discovered this complexity by minute cross-reference within the text; but these correspondences are to be made at peril of importing into the work standards unguessed at by the author. If, disregarding those who will have nothing whatever to do with the conception of 'character', we persist with our inquiry, then we must put the question in this form—can the Type under which Hamlet is presented—that of the Melancholy Man—have allowed the Elizabethan audience to apprehend the complexity and subtlety which *we* see in Hamlet's characterization? It is this very complexity that is here in question. There is nothing to stop a great creative artist making his representation of human nature, whatever the conventional base he starts from, as *profound* or as *great* as he will—as profound as Shakespeare's Macbeth or as great as his Lear. But this profundity or greatness will be a unified conception, resolving, it may be, major discords—as Macbeth's ambition and vacillation are resolved into ruthlessness—but *resolving* them none the less, to present a single conception. Yet the unified conception is precisely what we lack in *Hamlet*. How then to apprehend the tragic conflict?

I think it may be allowed that only by laying aside our preconceived notions of what is proper to the drama shall we enjoy what is in Shakespeare in its own right, and avoid mistaking it for sheer invention or arbitrary method. If, then, the true line of approach is by way of Elizabethan production in any kind under review, we may take up our question concerning *Hamlet* in some hope of a solution if we consider first the kind to which it belongs—the play of Revenge—and, second, Shakespeare's general characteristics in the treatment of Revenge and its related issues.

The Revenge Tragedy, however treated by the dramatist, quickly became a dominant form. Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* marked out a course fruitful for his successors in presenting the delays of Hieronimo before achieving the carnage that the genre demands—revenge 'pressed down and running over'. The delay in Kyd serves this main end—a mounting horror finally resolved in the blood-bath. Hieronimo delays; at first in despair of executing vengeance, later in doubt whether to leave his wrongs to Divine retribution: but finally he accepts the role of Avenger and his last act is the very top and bent of revenge. The murder play with which he 'fits' the evil-doers fulfils his dark promise: vengeance is exacted

not as the vulgar wits of men
 With open, but inevitable ills,
 As by a secret, yet a certain mean,
 Which under kindship will be cloaked best.

There is, however, another use of delay which later dramatists are to employ, writers who come after *Hamlet* and are not slow to learn from it. This use of delay may best be seen in Tourneur's *Atheist's Tragedy* and in Chapman's *Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois*. In both these plays the avenger delays, not from despair or indecision which are finally rejected in favour of the duty of Revenge, but—and this is of capital importance for our inquiry—because there is a scruple about revenge itself. The duty of revenge, finally triumphant in Kyd, is called into question throughout: is it justice? The Ghost of Tourneur's play maintains that we mortals must leave vengeance to Heaven. It is the Ghost who tells Charlemont that he is a wronged man; but the same Ghost adds

Attend with patience the success of things,
 But leave revenge unto the King of Kings.

Later, when Charlemont, drawing to defend himself, is about to kill his assailant in the name of 'Revenge' the Ghost intervenes:

Hold, Charlemont!
 Let Him revenge my murder and thy wrongs,
 To Whom the justice of revenge belongs.

'The justice of revenge'!—we have come a long way from the axiomatic compulsions of Kyd and Marston and the early Shakespeare. Tourneur's play tries to demonstrate, in its own queer fashion, the truth of the Ghost's solemn assertions: Charlemont, convinced of the truth, 'sums up' (the phrase is just):

Only to heaven I attribute the work
 Whose gracious motives made me still forbear
 To be mine own revenger. Now I see
 That Patience is the Honest Man's Revenge.

Chapman's play, three or four years later, rejects this simple solution, 'Leave it to Heaven'. Tourneur's hero had been the lay-figure in the demonstration of this moral. Chapman's hero, Clermont, starts with wholly explicit scruples about the justice of Revenge. Clermont is the wronged man who will not take vengeance, one who asks:

Shall we revenge villainy with a villainy? . . .
 Shall we equal be
 With villains? . . .
 We must wreak our wrongs
 So as we take not more.

And, again,

All worthy men should ever bring their blood
To bear an ill not to be wreak'd with good.

But this will not serve the needs of drama: the guilty must not go wholly unrequited. So the last Act opens with the Ghost of Bussy, the murdered man, risen from 'the Chaos of Eternal Night', to controvert this view of Clermont. This Ghost, 'the most philosophic Ghost in Elizabethan drama',¹ roundly condemns Clermont and proclaims man's duty to exact retribution:

Away then! use the means thou hast to right
The wrong I suffer'd.

Clermont consents to perform his duty of vengeance, but only on the terms of a fair duel: and so the evil-doer is dispatched, dying with pardon for Clermont and receiving in turn Clermont's forgiveness. Honour is satisfied: the wrong-doer has been fairly punished. The wild justice of Revenge has been overruled for the justice of even combat.

Now, both these plays exhibit clear reminiscences of *Hamlet*. Indeed, in Chapman's case, as Mr. Percy Simpson has pointed out,² this is the only play of his which shows an unmistakable debt to Shakespeare. It seems to me, then, at least possible that this major variation in the Revenge matter, the debating the issue Revenge versus Justice, following as it does on Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and owing much in incidental matter and phrase to *Hamlet*, may demonstrate what Shakespeare's immediate audience and his fellow dramatists apprehended in *Hamlet*—a reluctance to act which springs from a scruple about the justice of Revenge. But we dare advance no farther with this conjecture until we account for a capital difficulty—that Hamlet nowhere explicitly calls in question his duty of Revenge. He loathes it, spurns himself for loathing it, yet nowhere questions it as the deed he is bound to enact. Indeed, after the terrific success of the Play scene, Hamlet is hot for blood: he spares the kneeling Claudius only because to kill the king at prayer would not be measure for measure: Claudius must be dispatched as Hamlet's father was. It is not Claudius's mere death that will requite the original crime: that he shall be unprepared for death is all-important. Hamlet is here the true Avenger.

What then shall we say of the cause of Hamlet's delay? If it were a scruple about the justice of Revenge, would it not be odd indeed that the dramatist has nowhere made this explicit? Alternatively, is there any reason assignable for the dramatist's making his hero call in question almost everything under the sun *except* the duty of revenge?

Let us turn again to *The Atheist's Tragedy* and *The Revenge of Bussy*

¹ Percy Simpson, *The Theme of Revenge in Elizabethan Tragedy* [Brit. Acad. Lecture (Oxford, 1935)], p. 24.

² *Ibid.*, p. 22.

d'Ambois. I think we may see at once what is *wrong* with these plays. Tourneur and Chapman have made an *explicit* conflict between the duty of Revenge and the demands of justice. In making that conflict explicit they have insensibly destroyed the thematic unity of the Revenge kind. For, raise and reiterate scruples about the obligations of Revenge, and inevitably the universal issues will be subordinated; the focus of attention will be the point of honour and not the human agent. The intensity slackens to the pace of a debating match. The play becomes a thesis-play, from which every spectator can go away with rational opinions about the prudence or morality of the hero's acts. It is not so that dramatic intensity is achieved. The power that tragedy should have, of presenting universal issues, is lost; for all is subsumed under a single dilemma; the hero must bring all to the knife-edge of a single question—'How can vengeance be justice?' These heroes openly mouth their horror, indignation, or conditional acceptance of the task laid upon them. For an age addicted to the matter of Revenge this doubtless represents a new and pleasing variation on an old theme: accepting the axioms of the Revenge play proper, the contemporary public no doubt accepted with little difficulty this ratiocinative element. But, for a later age, the situation of Charlemont and Clermont is perilously close to farce. The reason, I take it, is in the dramatists' having made wholly and elaborately explicit the conflict between Revenge and Justice. But how if they had portrayed such a conflict in the hero, the man on whom the duty of vengeance is inescapably laid, *without* making him explicitly announce his scruples? In such a play we should surely have a situation which was that of pure tragedy—man condemned to do that which he feels is no true settlement of his wrongs; 'condemned', for example, by the inescapable authority of a father from beyond the grave. How, in effect, if that had already been done, and these dramatists were attempting, with less skill and with an eye to the real 'get-penny' qualities of the Revenge play, to re-create such another scrupulous hero as had delayed his revenge upon Claudius, King of Denmark?

If my suggestion has any substance, we should look for it in the general characteristics of Shakespeare's tragic production, and especially in his handling of the Revenge theme. If we are able to arrive at certain conclusions, albeit tentative, concerning his approach to and handling of this theme, we may perhaps be bolder in conjecture.

I begin by calling attention to that aspect of Shakespeare's art in general which, as I believe, few critics will dispute. However improbable, in the everyday sense, his starting-point, the initial data of the given play, what follows from those data is always elaborated in terms of universal human nature. The situation with which *Lear* opens, the unfathomed wickedness of Iago, have this in common—they are the *facts* from which the play

proceeds; they demand no explanation and assuredly receive none at the dramatist's hands. Make what we will of them, these are the axioms from which we are to proceed if we are to proceed at all. Modern criticism has re-emphasized and given a new setting to this acceptance by its insistence on the conventional basis of Elizabethan playwriting. Yet, as I have stressed, a just criticism will not fail to take account of Shakespeare's great creative power in relating the types and outlines of common Elizabethan dramatic usage to the human nature we know and feel for. If he exacts our willing suspension of disbelief at the outset, he nowhere asks it in the outworking of the play. (I mean the major issues with which the play is concerned, and not those minor uses of executive convention—as Impenetrable Disguise, and the like, which, of course, abound in him, though to be modified or superseded as suits his exquisite sense of theatre.) The observation of Johnson, that 'where the agency is supernatural, the dialogue is level with life' is true in the widest sense: Shakespeare is indeed the poet of 'Nature'.¹ It is this which surely compels our attention in his tragedies above all. He may call Fate by what name he will, whether it is bodied forth in the Witches or made the object of blind search by the defeated Gloucester or Othello. It is still none the less, exactly in so far as the play's action is concerned, nothing other than a limitation of the hero's field of choice—a limitation wholly consonant with real experience, compelling the human agent, being such a man as he is, to make the choice that involves disaster. Macbeth, for example, is at the outset merely an ambitious man. He is established as such, before his fatal choice, by Lady Macbeth's soliloquy: he always has been ambitious; and, what makes for 'the pity of it', he could go on being so.² But the field of choice for this ambitious man narrows. As the consequence of Cawdor's treachery a path is opened to the summit of ambition—the Crown. Confronted with *that* choice, Macbeth behaves as we, the spectators, know he will behave, must behave if he is to remain the man we know. He passes from vacillation, from mere hoping

¹ The observations with which Dr. Schücking concludes his British Academy lecture, *The Baroque Character of the Elizabethan Tragic Hero* (Oxford, 1938), are here of especial interest. Comparing Shakespeare's treatment of 'dramatic ingredients' with that of his fellows, Dr. Schücking observes, 'he is on the whole always to be found on the side of the natural—the word being used in a relative sense—as opposed to the mannered or artificial'.

² It will be understood that I am not speaking of our immediate experience as spectators, but attempting to make clear by analysis the ground of our intense and immediate feeling for the hero. There is no escape from the analytical method for exposition: but I do not, of course, suggest that the hero's plight is put before us in these terms by the Elizabethan dramatist, that there is any *direct* appeal to our sense of what Macbeth was or might be. He knows how to evoke our passionate interest without recourse to the elaborate 'verification' proper to the naturalistic artist; yet the ground of that interest, however aroused, remains the same. (We may well ask if this necessity of exposition is not a large cause of misunderstanding between 'Naturalist' and 'Conventionalist' critic.)

for the consummation he desires, to decisive action. Nothing here is strained, nowhere are we conscious of the author's hand overruling his creation for his own dramatic ends. No Shakespearian malefactor is evil 'by a divine thrusting on'. Shakespeare seems perfectly in his tragic production to have solved the capital problem of all creative art where the serious representation of human nature is in question. It in some sort resembles the problem of the 'old world's debate'—Predestination as against Free-Will. The author, whether dramatist, narrative poet, or novelist, has a plan for his creatures, and to that plan they must conform. But they represent human creatures, whose outstanding characteristic is a power of free choice. Exactly, then, in as far as the author overrules them, so they die upon his hands. They cease to interest us; losing the recognizable characteristic of the human nature we know, they become the author's puppets.

This, of course, can be done for our diversion in the thesis-play or comedy of types: but in tragedy any falsification of the issues, any tampering with the human nature we know and feel for, is intolerable. Shakespearian tragedy is especially striking in this respect. We may start with any improbability, and may employ accepted convention in the transitions of the play: but nowhere are we dealing with other than recognizable human nature, persons distinguished by their power to accept or reject the choices open to them. That we should feel pity and fear, that the spectator should identify himself with the tragic hero—to bring this about is the tragic artist's aim. But it is achieved only when the course of the drama has seemed to us, sharing the hero's human nature, wholly 'probable or necessary'. One manifest intervention by the dramatist, and *awe* is gone, and with it all our interest.

Now, if this be accepted, it is not hard to see what a problem the matter of Revenge presents. For the duty of vengeance offers either simple compulsion—the deed must be enacted—or, if that duty is explicitly called in question, all things must be brought to the test of a single and wholly rational question. It may at this point be objected that the argument from Shakespeare's other tragedies is misleading; *Hamlet*, his first major venture in tragedy, may be unrepresentative, may in fact be wholly or in part failure. To this I would reply that a consideration of Shakespeare's treatment of Revenge elsewhere may sufficiently show that the treatment in *Hamlet* is at once a necessary development and a master-stroke. I turn, then, to a consideration of his production in this kind. But before I take it up, I feel it desirable to say something of continuity in Shakespeare's production as a whole.

In our very proper desire to avoid fathering upon Shakespeare our own partial apprehensions of the content of his plays—more especially those

themes which make an immediate appeal to our own consciousness—there is a danger that we may overlook certain aspects of theme and presentation which are relatively constant in him. In our anxiety that he shall nowhere be identified with a particular person or persons of his drama, we perhaps tend to ignore *any* evidence at all of 'personality'. Let me emphasize at once that I here mean the author's *literary* personality—what Dryden would call his 'character'¹—those qualities of the chosen theme and its execution which underlie our judgement, 'This or that is Shakespearian: this other is not'. It is some years since R. W. Chambers² drew attention to the striking continuity, from the earliest History plays to the mature tragic period, of Shakespeare's presentation of the evil-doer's awareness of the evil done. From Richard on Bosworth field to Macbeth awaiting the avenging army, the main agent of evil realizes the waste he has wrought by seeing himself friendless, cut off from the natural and fruitful human relationships. Macbeth's great statement of disillusion speaks at once for all evil-doers in Shakespeare's dominant conception:

And that which should accompany old age,
As honour, love, obedience, troops of friends,
I must not look to have : . .

I would go farther and say that this conception, in its strict converse, determines the Last Plays. In the Tragedies the incalculable force of 'natural' loyalty and love is perverted by the main agent of evil. It is a mighty current that must be 'earthed' before disaster can come: so Ophelia is thrust out of Hamlet's path; Lear chooses the unnatural daughters; Lady Macbeth unsexes herself. All occasion of tenderness must be removed in order to make final ruin. But in the Last Plays we have a triumphant portrayal of the potential friendliness of the world man may make for himself if only the natural tie holds. It is set forth in the grave tenderness of human relationships, especially the relationship of parent and child. Here the mighty current leaps unimaginable gaps: the lost are found; the dead brought back to life. So Prospero abjures his 'rough magic' and takes his place in the world of man: he is for Naples and the wedding of his dear daughter.

If, then, this fund of 'Nature' is the dominant characteristic of Shakespeare's workmanship, it may be agreed that the Revenge matter presents the difficulty I have suggested. The Revenge kind is in its very nature hostile to this treatment. It will not do to have improbabilities, departures

¹ Cf. Dryden's advice to the translator: he must maintain 'the character of an author, which distinguishes him from all others, and makes him appear that individual poet whom you would interpret'. [Pref. to *Sylvae; Essays*, ed. W. P. Ker (Oxford, 1900), i. 254.]

² *The Jacobean Shakespeare and 'Measure for Measure'*, Brit. Acad. Lecture (Oxford, 1937).

from universal human nature, at the outset, and thereafter to mollify them, to bring a profound knowledge of humanity to bear on the outworking of the fable. For the Revenge matter demands a just remove from 'Nature' the whole way through from first to last line. Bring in recognizable human nature, and you ruin the thematic unity; for, ask the question, 'How can I do this thing?', and you prompt any audience not infatuated with Revenge to reply, 'Why do it at all?'

Nevertheless, it will be replied, the Elizabethans liked their Revenge matter; no playwright whose living was the theatre could mulct them of the sensationalism they loved. That is very true: but I think that if we consider Shakespeare's work in this field we may find that he has gone some way towards at once gratifying this taste and also making it theatrically plausible, towards shaping the matter in terms of his own dominant conception.

I begin with *Titus Andronicus*.¹ Here, we have some attempt to present the matter of Revenge in terms that do not violate our sense of the 'credible'; we are not delivered entire into this world of inordinate blood-lust, but it is placed at a remove from ordinary human concerns. Not, be it noted, by mitigation of horror: Aaron the Moor is flat evil: Lavinia's entry, 'her hands cut off, and her tongue cut out, and ravished', spares not the least refined sensibility. Rather, the reverse is true. Aaron's wickedness is thorough-going to an almost Puckish extent. His excesses include those goblin-like activities that vex the countryman; he will

Make poor men's cattle break their necks;
Set fire on barns and hay-stacks in the night,
And bid the owners quench them with their tears. . . .

He is a fiend who gleefully confesses his wickedness—'almost broke my heart with extreme laughter'. His reply to the reproaches of the real world,

Art thou not sorry for these heinous deeds?

is heartily unrepentant:

Ay, that I had not done a thousand more.

I do not think that the close comparison one critic² has drawn between this play and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* appeals merely to our curiosity. The

¹ My concern here is wholly with the developed characterization of Aaron, which seems to me wholly Shakespeare's work. The New Cambridge edition (Cambridge, 1948), which has come into my hands since writing this essay, establishes admirably the point I have tried to make in this brief account. I especially and warmly subscribe to the view: 'Critics have been unable to appreciate Aaron to the full, because, led astray by his superficial and spasmodic resemblances to Barabas, they have tended to take him too solemnly; they have failed to enjoy him, because they have not noticed how thoroughly he enjoys himself' (Introd. pp. lxii-lxiii).

² H. Baidon, in his edition of *Titus Andronicus* (Arden Shakespeare), ed. 1904, Introd., pp. lxvi ff., acknowledging indebtedness to Crawford, *Jahrb. der Deutschen Sh.-Gesellschaft* (Berlin, 1900), p. 109.

evil of Aaron, like the mischief of Puck, is limitless in its own sphere: but between them and the spectator, art has placed a *cordon sanitaire*. Aaron's place is not in this world; but, as he himself confesses, in a fiery hell—

So I might have your company in hell,
But to torment you with my bitter tongue!

Shakespeare in his maturity triumphs by showing the Evil Man, in Iago, 'as what he is, a symbol, not as what he is not, a human being'.¹ In this early play there is a compromise solution: where Aaron is wicked, he is given full rein, and wickedness overflows into impishness: but there is also an attempt to give him a credible human stature, in the scenes with his black child. The effect is to assure the spectator that the feigned events are related to the real world; a world which contains the evil of Aaron and is not contained by it. In *Titus Andronicus* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* alike, and by comparable methods, our interest in the monstrous or the marvellous is unhampered, for they are at a safe remove. The super-normal is not here presented as having a direct, though mysterious, relation with the world of real human concerns (that is the tragic method). Here, natural and unnatural occur side by side: the unnatural is in one sense quite arbitrary, but in another all too possible. This reinforcing the sense of the evil that might be is, of course, all that distinguishes success in this kind from failure. If the horrid merely *occurred* and drew all things into itself, we should have Grand Guignol; but this is not the aim of *Titus*. The play's effectiveness depends on our acceptance of the normal and the super-normal existing together. From this point of view, it is true, the disasters that mortals bring upon their heads, by incurring the wrath of the fiends, are almost a kind of bad luck. But who, the play over, will deny that he knows what bad luck is?

The solution of what to do with the vengeful man which we have just considered is, in effect—give him full rein; do not let his wickedness stop short at one main deed of Revenge, but let it overflow into sheer and thorough-going malice. In the late play *Timon of Athens* this principle receives its largest extension. The injured Timon becomes a misanthrope: we see the spectacle of human life as it presents itself to him; and as such it makes no strain on our human awareness. Timon is the 'passionate' man of a familiar tradition.² It is as natural for him to hate the world at large as it was for Tamburlaine to subdue it to himself. He can be 'bloody, bold and vengeful', for he is a perversion of our common nature. This the play emphasizes; there is no staying at the lonely eminence Timon occupies:

Here lie I, Timon; who, alive, all living men did hate:
Pass by, and curse thy fill; but pass and stay not here thy gait.

¹ Sir E. K. Chambers, *Shakespeare: a survey* (London, 1925), p. 220.

² On the 'passionate' hero, *vide* Schücking, *loc. cit.*, *passim*.

Between *Titus* and *Timon* there occurs what I take to be a substantial rejection of the Revenge matter—*Measure for Measure*. This difficult play has been variously condemned and praised; but, with the outstanding exception of R. W. Chambers,¹ most critics have agreed in finding some difficulty in the awkward plot and the extremes of characterization—the cold viciousness of Angelo opposed to the inviolable chastity of Isabella. Of this, at least, we can be sure—it is strangely unlike what Shakespeare gives us elsewhere. Not even *Troilus and Cressida*, which is often mentioned with it as a play about values rather than men and women, can compare with it in that most irritating device which strains our serious attention—the omnipresence of the disguised Duke. How to take seriously the predicament of Claudio or Isabella once we know that the Duke is fully aware of these goings-on, and will in his good time overrule all for good? Shakespeare is no mere journey-man of the theatre: how then to understand his choosing this gravely defective presentation?

I do not know that it has been noticed that in choosing to reshape Whetstone's *Promos and Cassandra*, a play at least twenty-five years old, Shakespeare had necessarily taken upon himself the task of remodelling the theme; for taste had changed in that quarter of a century. In Whetstone's play, Cassandra yields to Promos: Andrugio, her brother, spared by the gaoler, lurks in hiding until he comes to plead for Promos when the King has pronounced sentence on him. Now, acceptable as this may have been in Whetstone's day, it surely would not do for an audience habituated to Revenge. Andrugio—Claudio—once his sister is shamed, and he released from prison, must become the Avenger. Think what Tourneur or Webster would have made of such a plot!—the harping on female chastity, Isabella's yielding in passionate shame, the dastardly act of Angelo in none the less exacting the penalty of Claudio's life—all this the very soul of that 'drug-damned Italy' of which the audience never tired, and which they were to have in full measure from later dramatists. It is not, I feel, an impossible supposition that Shakespeare, whose very life was the theatre, saw in taking up the old play that if Isabella were to yield, Claudio must become the Avenger.

I follow Mr. R. H. Wilson² in holding it at least possible that an original Shakespearian *Measure for Measure* did present Isabella yielding to Angelo. But it seems to be inherently more likely that Shakespeare subsequently made Isabella preserve her honour not from any difficulty of motivating her yielding, as Mr. Wilson suggests, but from a desire to avoid the complications of revenge which must, in the contemporary public's expectancy, inevitably follow such yielding. The play came into existence when

¹ Loc. cit.; expanded in *Man's Unconquerable Mind* (London, 1939), pp. 250-310.

² 'The Mariana plot of *Measure for Measure*', *P.Q.* (1930), ix. 341-50.

Revenge was very much in vogue, in transition from its first 'classic' state, owing its main debt to Seneca, to that second state, where the authors need make no resort to Seneca. 'Kyd, Marston, and Shakespeare provided them with all that they needed in the way of suggestion, and their work moves freely within the lines of what had now become a tradition of the English stage. The sole task which they set themselves was to vary the pattern'.¹ Mr. Percy Simpson goes on to observe that the earliest of the second group, Chettle's *Hoffman*, was acted in 1602, when the *Spanish Tragedy* was republished with the 'Additions': as Mr. Simpson remarks, this is the time when Revenge plays were a real 'get-penny'.² I suggest that, at this time, adherence to Whetstone's fable of Isabella sacrificing her honour would almost certainly call for a revenge treatment: Claudio the Avenger would be the centre of interest, and the thematic unity of the story, forgiveness, inevitably overborne. Shakespeare therefore, I suggest, made Isabella inflexible in her chastity—that characterization which has troubled almost all who attend to the play—and was faced at once with a further problem: how to advance the play at all? Angelo must be shown as the perfidious wretch he is in all forms of the story, in order to effect the great scene of the play—the wronged Isabella pleading for his life. Shakespeare thus introduces the business of the Substituted Bride. But how to bring this plausibly in? He resorts to the unsatisfactory trick of the Duke's omnipresence. The world of *Measure for Measure* is one in which it is impossible to get lost—the disguised Duke hovers over all: he 'pulls the strings like a not-too-expert showman of marionettes'.³ If I am not wholly mistaken, Shakespeare has in this play implicitly rejected the matter of Revenge as intractable, alien to his characteristic treatment and methods. The cost of that rejection, in this instance, is a poor play. I do not dissent from Croce's verdict:

This play, which oscillates between the tragic and the comic, and has a happy ending instead of forming a drama of the sarcastic-sorrowful-horrible sort, fails to persuade us that it should have been thus developed and thus ended.⁴

The Editors of the New Cambridge Shakespeare quote this observation with approval. But their attempt to find a likely explanation for this state of affairs by inquiry into the play's textual history does not greatly assist us. For, even if we accept their view that the Folio text contains additions by a post-Shakespearian reviser, there is yet no contention that the shape of the play as we have it—the 'story' as it would appear in a prose epitome—has been significantly altered; and this is the cardinal difficulty for all readers and spectators.

I have suggested that the matter of Revenge was peculiarly unattractive

¹ P. Simpson, loc. cit., p. 27.

² Ibid., p. 28.

³ *Measure for Measure*; New Cambridge Edition (Cambridge, 1922), p. xv.

⁴ Ibid., quoted at p. xxv.

to Shakespeare as a working dramatist, and, more, that in one instance he rejects it at the cost of writing a poor play. Nevertheless, the Revenge matter, properly handled, offers great possibilities. It makes possible the presentation of the doomed man, one bidden by inescapable authority to certain acts. The intensity this offers is incalculable if the hero is bidden against his own conviction—more, against all desire and longing; if his very nature is revolted by what he must none the less perform. Conceive a man commanded to do what he has no assurance is right, and you have a situation of pure tragedy. But in the presentation it is of the highest importance that the hero shall not *openly* call in question the ethics or the efficacy of Revenge. Do that, and the thematic unity is broken; we pass from tragic intensity to controversial ardour. The true solution is to make the hero call in question all things under the sun *except* the duty that is enjoined upon him, for from that he cannot escape. This, I submit, is the tragic conflict in *Hamlet*: the hero averse from the deed that is required of him, seeking endlessly the cause of that aversion, calling it by any name but its own, and failing to know it for what it is. The contemporary audience, I suggest, and more particularly Shakespeare's fellow playwrights, apprehended it as a conflict between Revenge and Justice. But the important consideration is that it remains unknown to Hamlet: Tourneur's and Chapman's heroes are aware of this conflict, Hamlet is not. The Elizabethan audience sees in him delay springing from a source that remains a mystery to Hamlet. Shakespeare's triumph is to make the hero fail to understand himself. Hamlet gives us *reasons* enough for delay, *causes* none: for the cause remains unknown to him. In so doing Shakespeare is able fully to meet the contemporary appetite for the sensationalism of Revenge, while avoiding its greatest peril—that the centre of interest should be in one topic or dilemma, to revenge or not? *Hamlet*, I hold, is pure tragedy—man condemned to do what he has no assurance is right. Shakespeare is able to derive all the force of a mythology from the contemporary audience's acceptance of a central dilemma which the dramatist need nowhere make explicit. *They* feel, as we cannot, save by the exercise of the historical imagination, that Hamlet has in reality no choice but to work vengeance. *They* feel a despair which the modern critic too often finds in Hamlet's temperament rather than his situation. It is not long, as we have seen, before other dramatists make this conflict explicit, and apparent to the hero. Their heroes call in question this very duty of Revenge. In doing so, as we have seen, they destroy any power of presenting universal issues, since they bring the central issue to a wholly rational and therefore limited level. But in Shakespeare's handling of Revenge, the situation of pure tragedy arises; for, in the hero's failure to understand himself, we are nowhere localized to a single dilemma: everywhere, by every resource of imaginative

penetration, we are confronted with the eternal issue—shall man endure this hostile universe? 'To be or not to be?—that is the question.'

If this interpretation is anywhere near the truth, certain episodes and utterances take on a deeper significance. For example, the play-scene: Hamlet's aim here is certainly to prove the authenticity of the Ghost; but more, I think—there is the suggestion of 'the intellectual's revenge'. Claudius is to 'unkennel' 'his damned guilt'. If we see Hamlet as the scrupulous Avenger, there is the suggestion here of process of law following on the guilty man's confession. We recall Hieronimo's first impulse when the *proof* of his son's murder is at hand: he will 'Cry aloud for justice through the Court'. But this resolve is overborne in Hieronimo; he will be revenged. If we conceive Hamlet averse from the deed of vengeance, the solution of bringing Claudius to open confession may well be the secondary function he conceives for The Mousetrap.¹ With the terrific success of the Play, however, all doubts momentarily at rest, Hamlet rages for blood. But, the fit past, the aversion comes back with redoubled strength: that aversion which torments Hamlet and which he will call by any name but its own.

Again, if this view be accepted, there is a greater emphasis and significance for the theme of Death—'the subject of *Hamlet* is death' says Mr. Lewis.² In the Elizabethan acceptance of Revenge there is no escape for Hamlet from his duty, except in death: so he recoils from a world into which it had been better not to be born. He sees humanity as propagated corruption: it is better that Ophelia go to a nunnery than breed sinners. In this play the old tragedy of Revenge, 'blood will have blood', comes face to face with the new, 'O cursed spite, that ever *I* was born to set it right!'

I have suggested that Hamlet delays his revenge on Claudius because of an aversion from the deed of vengeance, an aversion whose true nature remains hidden from him, but is apprehended by the Elizabethan audience as a deep-seated scruple about the justice of Revenge. Hamlet, averse from the deed, is contrasted with Laertes, hot to avenge the wrong done him. Shakespeare makes clear what we are attending to when he places Hamlet's procrastination in the same context as Laertes's impetuous decision. Laertes responds eagerly to Claudius's suggestions: for vengeance, anything will

¹ I would therefore interpret the conclusion of Hamlet's soliloquy at the end of Act II thus: the best to be hoped for from the play is open confession from Claudius; but even the least sign of disquiet will be proof of guilt. The King is therefore to be watched intently, and in this Hamlet enlists the aid of Horatio (III. ii. 80-91). This will be unnecessary labour if Claudius should behave like those 'guilty creatures' Hamlet has heard of, who were moved to proclaim 'their malefactions'. But of course it is vital that the least sign of uneasiness be not missed. On this, then, Hamlet concentrates, and plans his meeting with Horatio after the play shall have been enacted: no need to plan what is to be done if the best comes off, and Claudius is a self-confessed villain!

² 'Hamlet': *the Prince or the Poem?*, Brit. Acad. Lecture (Oxford, 1942), p. 12.

serve against the enemy; Laertes is prepared 'to cut his throat i' the church'. Claudius speaks for all avengers in the old tradition:

No place, indeed, should murder sanctuarise;
Revenge should have no bounds . . .

I agree with Mr. Percy Simpson that we can find 'a hint of what he [Shakespeare] thought of the rant of the Revenge Play'¹ in the scene of Laertes's leaping into his sister's grave with the cry:

Now pile your dust upon the quick and dead,
Till of this flat a mountain you have made
To o'er-top old Pelion or the skyish head
Of blue Olympus.

Hamlet's stinging rejoinder

Nay, an thou'lt mouth,
I'll rant as well as thou,

puts this fustian contemptuously aside. So, as I think, Laertes's principle of Revenge—Revenge should have no bounds—is equally abhorrent to Hamlet: while Revenge yet remains the deed he must spur himself to.² Let us turn to his self-examination when put to shame at sight of the Norwegian expedition. Hamlet here makes the best analysis he can of the reasons for his delay:

Now, whether it be
Bestial oblivion, or some craven scruple
Of thinking too precisely on the event—
A thought, which, quarter'd, hath but one part wisdom
And ever three parts coward—I do not know
Why yet I live to say, 'This thing's to do',
Sith I have cause, and will, and strength, and means
To do't . . .

—'I do not know': so he makes an end of knowledge, of the search for reasons:

Oh, from this time forth,
My thoughts be bloody, or be nothing worth!³

¹ Loc. cit., p. 17.

² Cf. the terms in which Laertes rejects all considerations other than the pursuit of Revenge for a father (iv. v. 130-5):

To hell, allegiance! vows, to the blackest devil!
Conscience and grace, to the profoundest pit!
I dare damnation. To this point I stand,
That both the worlds I give to negligence,
Let come what comes; only I'll be reveng'd
Most thoroughly for my father.

We see the significance of the Ghost's admonition, 'Taint not thy mind': Laertes's wild rage for vengeance is a 'point' to which Hamlet may not come.

³ Hamlet's aversion from the code of Revenge is movingly expressed in his amazement

But whatever Hamlet fails to know, we the spectators have some knowledge of Hamlet that will enable us to interpret this tortured self-communing. We know that no 'bestial oblivion' has possession of Hamlet; that indeed the thought of the deed will give him no rest. More, we know that Hamlet is no coward in the ordinary sense. He does not hesitate at the fact of bloodshed; not even the grim necessity of dispatching his enemies, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, will deter him. Hamlet does not shrink from bloodshed in a fair cause; for it is a necessity of virtual warfare that these two be sent to death. And, most important, there is no hesitation in Hamlet when, engaged as he thinks in fair fight, he knows that the foils are unbated: tricked upon the point of honour, Hamlet strikes back, blow for blow. His enemies have betrayed him with the envenomed point; he will requite them in the same mode—and among them is that Claudius, King of Denmark, who, paying for his practice at Hamlet's life, pays at once for the greater wrong that has made Hamlet's a life in death. Hamlet's aversion to Revenge is overborne in that duel which Chapman seized upon to resolve *his* hero's dilemma, the duel that in *his* play requites the evil-doer while honourably acquitting the avenger. The point is of some importance, for it shows at once how Shakespeare has resolved his hero's anguished indecision and also how mighty a consequence the act has for the hero. Let us look again at this last act of Hamlet's.

Hamlet strikes down the King for his part in the treachery of the unbated and envenomed foils. Immediately he strikes the King with the envenomed point, there is Hamlet's revenge accomplished, though all without his contriving. But his last act is characteristic of the man we know; although it is unnecessary labour, Hamlet will of his own choice *contribute* to Claudius's death. Claudius is already poisoned to the death for his part in treachery: but Hamlet, crying out the King's deeper guilt, will force the poisoned wine between his teeth. Hamlet has fulfilled his mission. Though death has come to Claudius by no means that Hamlet had premeditated, yet at this ultimate moment, when he and Hamlet are both hastening to death, Hamlet will dispatch the King in obedience to his father's command. Hamlet has not solved his great question; but now that what he was bidden to exact as Revenge has been accomplished as a just return for treachery,

at the 'examples gross as earth' which 'exhort' him to the deed, concluding in his definition of 'honourable' conduct:

Rightly to be great
Is not to stir without great argument,
But greatly to find quarrel in a straw
When honour's at the stake.

This is all that 'god-like reason' can conclude. It is echoed in his words of apology to Laertes, the 'honourable' man by this code, before the duel: and receives the veiled reply that 'honour' is not so easily satisfied—'in my terms of honour I stand aloof', says the vengeful man; that 'honour' which sanctions the treachery of the foils.

Hamlet postpones for ever his questioning and acts as the Avenger. Hamlet, then, achieves his end; but not 'honourably', as Chapman's fantastic Clermont is to do, for the centre of interest in Shakespeare's play is not in the ethic of Revenge, but in the overburdened human agent. Hamlet achieves his end by laying aside for ever the scruple that had tormented him.

I think, then, we may see why Hamlet becomes an enigmatic figure to later generations. I date the failure to understand *Hamlet* potentially from the closing of the theatres. When they reopen, the wild theme of Revenge, however treated, demands explicit portrayal; the axiomatic compulsions of the revenge code are forgotten. They are to be revived for *us* only by the exercise of the historical imagination. But, when the historical imagination is brought to bear, we ask for data in the hero's utterance, forgetting, as I see it, that what for us is necessary—an explicit questioning—is given by an audience who know what they have come to see: and, more, that an explicit treatment of the conflict in the hero's soul will tend inevitably to ruin the play's power of presenting universal issues. The contemporary success of *Hamlet* will mean that other dramatists will be quick to make this conflict wholly and elaborately explicit. Their heroes will openly mouth their horror, indignation, and reluctance to obey the code of Revenge. But, in doing so, the dramatist will hopelessly limit the scope of his play: for all issues will be brought to the single dilemma—Justice or Revenge? Dealing with the dangerous material of the Scrupulous Avenger, Shakespeare triumphs: avoiding the peril of making his hero mouth his scruples, Shakespeare makes him fail to understand himself, casting him in the type of the Melancholy Man. In so doing, he is able to make Hamlet call in question all things under the sun, including, most poignantly, the nature of Man, without once bringing to the light the cause of his own aversion. That cause, I have suggested, the Elizabethan audience apprehended as a scruple about the justice of Revenge. But, in the last resort, it is not of the highest importance to ask whether Hamlet had any inkling at all of the truth, or whether all his efforts at understanding fell hopelessly short. The important thing is that he should *fail* to know—by whatever margin—and, failing, that he should persist in his seeking. From this endless quest proceeds the mighty power of the play: though the wild theme of Revenge has faded for us, our assent is still won to this portrayal of man questioning all things, and understanding nothing, least of all one man's aversion from a duty which must be performed in the teeth of all inclination and desire. To those who find a failure in universal appeal, we must reply that this is the universal tragedy. For, as the beginning of wisdom is self-knowledge, so the universal predicament is that of Hamlet; for all his impassioned questioning, man fails to know himself.

CORIOLANUS, ARISTOTLE, AND BACON

By F. N. LEES

IT is the suggestion, in the first place, of this article that manifested in *Coriolanus* is a distinct assimilation of certain passages in the *Politics* of Aristotle; and, in view particularly of T. W. Baldwin's recent writings on Shakespeare's 'small Latin and less Greek', that this is most probably traceable to the first English translation of that work, printed in London in 1598.¹

What I shall be drawing attention to will not be Aristotelian *sententiae* modified by Shakespeare's individual vocabulary and rhythmic dramatic utterance and spoken by his characters, but certain fundamental ideas which I suspect to have implanted themselves in Shakespeare's mind, to emerge on the right occasion in characteristic imaginative form. The expression given to these in the 1598 edition is, I believe, such that, even on a rapid flipping over of the pages, they could well be attracted into an alert and active imagination, to join or await material and attitudes springing from other reading or experience. I should hesitate long before trying to decide whether the elements I claim to be Aristotelian preceded, followed, or otherwise mingled with the Plutarchian ones; but I suggest that they played a part with them in the imaginative process akin to a chemical reaction which produced Shakespeare's version of the *Coriolanus* story. The relationship that I believe to have existed may, that is, be one of considerable complexity and no more precisely traceable than most processes of an imagination that amalgamates, not merely records, impressions.

In order to establish a resemblance between two objects it is as well for all concerned to be looking at them from the same angle, and as there have been many conflicting accounts of *Coriolanus* it will be useful to describe briefly the view of it in which affinities with Aristotle are detected.

This is that the play exhibits the tragedy of a man of great martial gifts and a lofty but restricted sense of honour, potentially the embodiment of the finest spirit of his society but so crippled by an excess of pride and a pitiful lack of human feeling as to be unfitted for the life of a right social animal. This is the figure in the foreground, the centre-point of our attention, but it is vitally linked with the persons and groups which surround it; and *Coriolanus* is seen to be in immediate and significant relationship with *Volumnia*, who, vicariously Amazonian and obsessed by the breeding of an over-specialized warrior-mechanism, monopolizes his attention, to the

¹ *Aristotles Politiques, or Discourses of Government. Translated out of Greeke into French, with Expositions taken out of the best Authours. . . . By Loys Le Roy, called Regius Translated out of French into English. At London printed by Adam Islip Anno Dom: 1598.* Translator signs dedicatory epistle 'I. D.'.

virtual exclusion of his wife. (The latter's place, one feels, is that of an indispensable agent in the process of breeding heroes—and promising indeed is the 'noble' child who marmocks butterflies—though for Shakespeare she represents true womanhood and vividly stands for the human sympathy Coriolanus and others in the play do not possess.) The spiral, as it were, of our attention and criticism runs widening through the patri- cians, whose tendencies Coriolanus more finely displays, with their lack of sympathy for the people; and through the people themselves, who, officered by self-seekers and as a group unreliable and violent, are yet by nature genial and kind. It is a study of the inhibition of the vital power of sympathy in one man, which is given a certain significant extension and additional profundity by linkage of the man with his similarly sick society. At the core is restricted and perverted emotion, a radical immaturity, what E. M. Forster in another connexion has called 'the undeveloped heart',¹ and Coriolanus, its symbol, is studied alive in the living body politic, not cut away for separate dissection.

The part played by the 'belly' fable and the disease and body imagery arising from it has been much emphasized by commentators, and imagery (and other effects) concerned with machine-like, inhuman insentience ('he walks like an engine' and so on), and of a city and its buildings, has been well indicated.² The great amount of animal imagery, however, to which I here attach importance, has, though noted, been given little special consideration as such by previous writers.³

¹ In his essay 'Notes on the English character', in *Abinger Harvest* (London, 1940). It is worth noticing here how little Coriolanus resembles St. Paul's 'Charity' in 1 Corinthians xiii; and pertinent to quote Aristotle's *Ethics* (translated into English in 1547) on Friendship:

Again it seems that friendship or love is the bond which holds states together, and that legislators set more store by it than by justice; for concord is apparently akin to friendship, and it is concord that they especially seek to promote, and faction, as being hostility to the state, that they especially try to expel.

Ethics, viii. i (J. E. C. Welldon's trans., London, 1897).

The *Ethics* makes interesting companion reading to Shakespeare; though one must not forget standard Christian thought.

² See Caroline Spurgeon, *Shakespeare's Imagery* (Cambridge, 1935); G. Wilson Knight, *The Imperial Theme* (Oxford, 1931), and D. A. Traversi's 'Coriolanus', *Scrutiny*, vi (1937), 43-58.

³ Probably because, to judge from Spurgeon's count, it forms part of one of the largest groups, if not the largest, of Shakespeare's images; and is used very simply and directly, even, it may be thought, unimaginatively. Spurgeon gives no separate prominence to it. J. C. Maxwell, however, in 'Animal Imagery in *Coriolanus*', *M.L.R.* xlii (1947), 417, suggestively draws attention to it. While not suggesting 'that any very momentous conclusions present themselves', he considers that the play shows in 'the workings of Shakespeare's imagination . . . a cohesion as complete as in his . . . more complex works' and that its 'pervading characteristics cannot simply be attributed to an uninspired faithfulness to North's *Plutarch*'. He sees an irrelevance in Menenius's 'body politic' image 'to the concerns and outlook of the central character'; for Coriolanus, he interestingly remarks, 'is not a "political animal" any more than the plebeians are'.

Some of it is applied to Coriolanus, who is at the start 'a very dog' and is in turn likened to 'a serpent', 'a steed', 'a lamb', 'a bear', 'a viper', 'a lonely dragon',¹ and 'a male tiger', for example; but mostly it is used by him with reference to others, who are likened to 'curs', 'hares' when they should be 'lions', 'rats', 'crows', 'apes', and so on. Only very few of such expressions are spoken neither by him nor concerning him: such imagery is markedly grouped about him, is by him set in motion in the author's mind. It is not suggested that the personality of Coriolanus can be assessed by taking a simple poll of animal images cast at him and by him²—it is, in fact, his own frequent recourse to them that is especially effective³—but what is unmistakable is the atmosphere of animality that clings to the hero throughout the play. There are on the other hand the following remarks:

such a poother,
As if that whatsoever god who leads him
Were slyly crept into his human powers,
And gave him graceful posture. (II. i. 214.)

the nobles bended
As to Jove's statue. (II. i. 261.)

You speak o' the people
As if you were a god to punish, not
A man of their infirmity. (III. i. 79.)

If Jupiter
Should from yond cloud speak divine things,
And say 'Tis true', I'd not believe them more
Than thee, all noble Marcius. (IV. v. 105.)

He is their god: he leads them like a thing
Made by some other deity than Nature,
That shapes man better. (IV. vi. 91.)

This last old man, . . .
Lov'd me above the measure of a father;
Nay, godded me indeed. (v. iii. 8.)

I'll never
Be such a gosling to obey instinct, but stand,
As if a man were author of himself. (v. iii. 34.)

Thou hast affected the fine strains of honour,
To imitate the graces of the gods;

¹ Said by Coriolanus himself.

² Nor that the mere reiteration of related images constitutes dramatic poetry, still less poetic drama.

³ It may be remarked that this animal imagery is not especially repulsive as sometimes elsewhere in the plays.

To tear with thunder the wide cheeks o' the air,
And yet to charge thy sulphur with a bolt
That should but rive an oak.

(v. iii. 149.)

He wants nothing of a god but eternity and a heaven to throne in.

(v. iv. 24.)

Because of the contrast of this variously intended conjunction of Coriolanus and divinity with the constant strain of animality (woven with the other strains of critical imagery) the phrase from the *Politics* 'He that is incapable of living in a society is a god or a beast'¹ has long seemed to me a fitting brief comment on the play.²

An examination of the 1598 *Politics* suggests that this application may be more than fortuitously apt, and that some parts of Aristotle's book provided seed for the good ground of Shakespeare's imagination. The following are the passages that seem to me worthy of attention. Throughout, it is the paramountcy and 'natural' ordination of the concept of the City, the doctrine of the inseparability of Man from his fellows³ and the formulation of the proposition 'either a god or a beast', that seem to me so fully to agree with the sense of the play; and the 'city' imagery and 'god' and animal imagery, not traceable to Plutarch's account, provide the links.

'The First Booke, Chap. II' has the heading:

What is a Citie: and that it consisteth by nature: and that man is naturally a sociable and ciuill creature.

And it begins:

A Citie is a perfect and absolute assembly or communion of many townes or streets in one, hauing alreadie attained to the highest pitch of perfection and selfe-sufficiencie, and being ordained not onely to this end to liue, but also to liue well: And seeing that the former simple societies haue their beginning from nature, therefore also a cittie doth subsist by nature.⁴

The 1598 edition has very ample glosses by I. D. which are inserted in the text of Aristotle in such a way as to make it difficult at first to see where Aristotle pauses and I. D. takes over. It is because of the prominence of

¹ George C. Taylor's 'Shakespeare's use of the idea of the Beast in Man', *S.P.* xlii (1945), 530, in which he refers to Theodore Spencer's *Shakespeare and the Nature of Man*, should be mentioned here. Neither touches on the matter of my article, but Taylor promises to deal later with the ideas of all 'Humanists' on Man reckoned as on one side beast, on the other a God. The promised article has not yet appeared.

² Suggested to me by Delmore Schwartz's use of it as a motto for his poem 'Coriolanus and His Mother' in *In Dreams begin Responsibilities* (Norfolk, Conn., 1938). This poem is therefore partly responsible for my approach.

³ A doctrine seen, e.g., in Donne's 'No man is an island' (*Devotions*, xvii). One way of arguing my point would be to emphasize the fact that this is not the analogy used by Shakespeare.

⁴ I. D.'s *Politics* (hereafter called *I. D.*), p. 11; Jowett's (1885) trans. (i. 2), p. 3.

these glosses in the text that I shall quote some of them at some length. The gloss to the above passage runs:

When many dwell together, and by mutuall communicating of their seuerall labours, workes, and goods, liue sufficiently, and use the same lawes and customes, they are called Citizens, and their place of habitation a Citie: but when they reach not unto that sufficiencie which I haue spoken of, then they violate their societie and loose the title of a Citie and Citizens: which is a most euident argument, that the verie essence of a City consisteth in that. Plato in his fourth booke *De Legib.* complaineth of many Common-wealthes that were not Cities, but certaine habitations in villages where the weaker yeilded seruice to the stronger, and the whole gouernment was denominated of the part that ouer-ruled.¹

I quote the gloss to illustrate I. D.'s own additional emphasis on the concept and its exacting requirements, and would recall the failure of Shakespeare's Rome to perform such 'mutuall communicating', Coriolanus's reluctance to use 'the same . . . customes',² and his 'these quarter'd slaves' in the first scene, for which there might be sufficient suggestion here.

Aristotle continues:

Out of all which it appeareth, that a Cittie is by nature: and that by nature also a man is a Ciuill and sociable creature: and also that he which naturally and not by accident or chaunce is cittlesse and unsociable, is to be esteemed either a wicked wretch, or more then a man, as hee on whome Homer raileth saying: That hee was both tribelesse, lawlesse, and houselesse. For as soone as a man findeth himselfe by nature to be such, forthwith hee hunteth after warre, as being not restrained by the yoke of marriage, euen as it falleth out among foules of the aire.³

The naturalness of the City is here reiterated and emphasis laid on the right nature of Man as 'Ciuill and sociable'—and the present-day notion of a 'civil' man is not to be excluded. The strength of disapproval of the 'unsociable' is marked, the 'beast or god' notion is adumbrated; and while

¹ *I. D.*, p. 12.

² II. ii. 133: *Men.*

It then remains

That you do speak to the people.

Cor. I do beseech you,

Let me o'erleap that custom . . .

Men. Pray you, go fit you to the custom . . .

Cor. It is a part

That I shall blush in acting, and might well

Be taken from the people.

II. iii. 116:

Cor. Custom calls me to 't:

What custom wills, in all things should we do 't,

The dust on antique time would lie unswept . . .

. . . Rather than fool it so.

(All references to *Arden Shakespeare*.)

³ *I. D.*, p. 12; Jowett (i. 2), p. 4.

'tribelesse, lawlesse, and houselesse' are not literally applicable to Coriolanus until his exile, his spiritual state seems subtly equivalent.¹ Although his house is early and vividly introduced, in the domestic scene between the three women, Coriolanus is never permitted to be in similar domesticity, and this plotting contributes much to the effect of the play. 'Hunteth after warre' has an obvious connexion, and 'not restrained by the yoke of marriage' is relevant: he is no sooner home from the taking of Corioles than he is wishing he 'had a cause to seek' Aufidius at Antium, and his only reference to the joy of marriage is in respect of battle and bloodshed.² I. D. glosses thus:

And if by chance there be any such monster extant, which by a particular inclination should shun and auoid Ciuill societie, hee ought to be reputed as most wicked, a louer and stirrer up of warres and seditions, and a most bloody and cruell tyrant.³

which I quote to show the vigour of his support of Aristotle.

Aristotle proceeds:

Howbeit the Citie is before the house and euery one of us: for of necessitie the whole is before the part: for if the whole perish, there will remaine neither foote nor hand, sauing in name onely: as for example, if one should call that a hand which is made of stone, because a dead hand would be like unto it. All things are defined by their operation and power, insomuch that when they cease to be such, they must no longer be called such in substance, but in name onely. Therefore is it cleere and manifest without all doubt, that a Cittie is by nature and before any one of us: For if euery man seuered and set alone, is not sufficient for himselfe, hee will be so affected toward the whole, namely the Cittie, as other partes that are sundred from their whole. But he that can not abide to live in companie, or through sufficiencie hath need of nothing, is not esteemed a part or member of a Cittie, but is either a beast or a God.⁴

¹ Plutarch, too, has: '... and that remembered not how wilfulnes is a thing of the world, which a gouernour of a common wealth for pleasing should shonne, being that which Plato called solitarines . . . all men . . . who will never yeld to others reason, but to their owne: remain without companie, and forsaken of all men.' North's *Plutarch (Tudor Translations)*, ii. 160. F. C. Kolbe, *Shakespeare's Way* (London, 1930), quotes this from Plutarch with his suggestion that 'aloneness' is the dominant note of the play.

² I. vi. 29: Mar.

O, let me clip ye

In arms as sound as when I woo'd; in heart
As merry as when our nuptial day was done,
And tapers burned to bedward.

This is significantly paralleled by Aufidius in IV. v. 117:

but that I see thee here,
Thou noble thing, more dances my rapt heart
Than when I first my wedded mistress saw
Bestride my threshold.

³ I. D., p. 12.

⁴ Ibid., p. 15; Jowett (i. 2), pp. 4-5.

Again the overriding importance of the City stands out—all this emphasis is within a few pages—and there is in ‘there will remaine neither foote nor hand . . .’ and so on, a point of contact with Plutarch’s ‘body’ analogy; with, finally, the clinching statement of ‘is either a beast or a God’. I. D.’s gloss ponderously stresses the ‘body’ notion:

when the whole perisheth, the partes perish and loose their use, and so consequently their right name: As for example, when a man is dead, there remaineth no longer in him neither eye, foote, nor hand . . . I meane, the eye wherewith we see, and wherein lyeth the power of seeing; the foote wherewith we walk, & wherein lieth the power of walking; the hand wherewith we handle, and wherein lyeth the power of handling: which members when they cease to be such.¹

The remaining passages come from much farther on in the book and relate to points other than the central ideas stressed so far. Not striking but possibly pertinent to the view that Shakespeare does not reserve his critical eye for either the patricians or the plebeians is:

For except the gouernour bee temperate and iust, how will he gouerne well? or if the subject bee not, how shall hee well obey? Verily, being intemperate and fearefull, hee will doe nothing that is comely and meete.²

From the same page is:

Therefore it is behoofefull so to deeme of all vertues, as a certaine Poet did of a woman’s silence, saying, that silence was an ornament to her, but not to the man in like sort. Sith therefore the childe is unperfect, doubtlesse his vertue ought not to bee imputed to himselfe, but to the perfecter, and him that is his gardian and gouernour.

The ‘Poet’ is Sophocles³ and the allusion is interestingly like Coriolanus’s ‘My gracious silence, hail!’, and the characterization of Virgilia it epitomizes, for which the nearest parallel suggested by editors has been a passage in Plutarch’s *Life of Numa* which runs:

For he [Numa] would say he had the most part of his revelations of the Muses and he taught the Romans to reverence one of them above all the rest, who was called Tacita, as ye would say Lady Silence.

The rest of this piece from Aristotle (‘Sith therefore the childe’) is not without bearing on Coriolanus’s acknowledged debt to his mother, and to considerations of upbringing referred to in the following excerpt:

in instructing of children, some men apply themselves to get a champion-like actiuite. . . . And though the Lacedemonians haue not false into this error,

¹ I. D., p. 16.

² Ibid., p. 56; Jowett (i. 13), p. 23.

³ *Ajax*, 293; R. C. Jebb’s trans. (Cambridge, 1896), pp. 54, 55.

yet do they with labour make themselves beastlike and unmanlike, as though that were a great furtherance to manhood and fortitude. Howbeit, as wee haue often said, we must not respect one vertue alone, nor this especially. . . . Therefore they should cheefly be exercised in honesty, and not in cruelty: for neuer will any wolfe or other brute beast adventure themselues in any honest danger, but rather an honest man. They therefore which herein yeeld too much libertie to children, and care not for instructing them in necessary things, doe make them very vile; and by supposing to make them seruiceable to the Commonweale in one worke onely, they make them worse then others.¹

which I. D. glosses:

Two faults . . . committed in teaching the facultie of exercise to children: . . . the other is, that they make them beastlike and cruell, by directing their whole training to one martiall vertue alone.²

These points may be thought relevant to the meaning of the glimpses we get of Young Martius, and in turn to Coriolanus himself. There is a link with Plutarch's 'for lacke of education, he [Coriolanus] was so chollericke and impacient' and 'the greatest benefit that learning bringeth . . . is this: that it teacheth . . . to be civill and curteous, and to like better the meane state, then the higher'.³ And here, as elsewhere, I cannot believe that Shakespeare would be unaware of the implications of the name 'Martius'.

One final passage I quote, not as particularly cogent, but for the sake of completeness:

For Agamemnon heard patiently reuiling speeches and taunts in publicke assemblies, but out of an assemblie had free and entire power of putting to death, for so hee sayeth: Whome I shall see to depart from the battaile to the Nauiie, let not him thinke that hee so escaped the foules and the dogges: and in another place, I haue sentence and cheefe power of death in my handes.⁴

It is, at any rate, prominent in Shakespeare's play that Coriolanus does not move thus easily to a civic behaviour, which demands his hearing 'patiently' 'reuiling speeches and taunts', from a martial one in which he calls 'all the contagion of the south' on 'the fliers', and in which, as Volumnia says.

Death, that dark spirit, in's nery arm doth lie:

Which, being advanc'd declines, and then men die.

(II. i. 157.)

¹ *I. D.*, p. 385; Jowett (viii. 4), pp. 248-9. The word 'wolfe' in this passage recalls the difficulty of 'woolvish gowne' (*Coriolanus*, II. iii. 114). 'Does "wolvisch" mean "made of wool"?' asked Coleridge, 'if it means "wolfish", what is the sense?' Perhaps the Aristotelian significance of the animal epithet would have helped him, and would give support to the 'wolf in sheep's clothing' suggestion some editors have favoured.

² *I. D.*, p. 386.

³ Plutarch, op. cit., p. 144.

⁴ *I. D.*, p. 168; Jowett (iii. 14), p. 96.

Clearly, not every detail in these pieces appears in identical form in the play, and it is not my suggestion that Shakespeare is attempting to illustrate Aristotle's case for him. Rather is it that the major elements I have indicated have just the salience and suggestiveness to be at once absorbed by the avid actualizing imagination of the dramatic poet; and that, with the grasp of the essential similarity between Aristotle's fairly extreme and obvious 'monster' and Plutarch's great, proud, and humanly incapacitated Roman, the correspondences registered set the angle of his regard accordingly and actuate a release into his vision of the related imaginatively potent impressions with which the *Politics* has charged his mind. I may illustrate the kind of process I have in mind by returning to the question of Coriolanus's essential 'houselessness', his spiritual isolation. Always he is 'in companie' but not of it, and his essential 'solitarines', in suspense hitherto, is only precipitated, his paradoxical situation resolved, by his 'I banish you' and the departure which so pungently evokes a terrible wilderness and solitude, with its 'like to a lonely dragon, that its fen . . .' and his disappearance into an undescribed nowhere before reappearing in Antium 'muffled'. There is here a step in logic, but it is made by purely poetic and dramatic means. It may be said that the play holds a syllogism which, in Aristotle's terms, may be expressed thus: 'He which naturally is unsociable is cittlesse, tribelesse, lawlesse and houselesse. Coriolanus is unsociable. Therefore Coriolanus is cittlesse, tribelesse, lawlesse and houselesse.' Aristotle, so to say, provides the major premiss and consequently the particular force of the conclusion; Plutarch provides the minor, and the character and course of events needed to arrive at the conclusion. Subsumed in this there is, of course, the syllogism which may be considered purely Plutarchian: 'All men who will never yeld to others reason are forsaken of all men. Coriolanus will never yeld to others reason. Therefore Coriolanus is forsaken of all men.' But this only faintly suggests the kind and degree of feeling which floods into the play with Coriolanus's banishment and the utter blankness into which he goes, which is Shakespeare's poetic enunciation of the syllogism's conclusion and, simultaneously, of its major premiss. Hitherto only the minor premiss has fully existed in the play; here he gives it logical consequence by non-logical means. Now Plutarch has no suggestion of the powerful 'I banish you', and he deals with the departure in a matter-of-fact way. He says, in fact, 'So he remained a few days in the countrie at his houses', which goes far to annul his remarks about 'solitarines' and which is totally rejected by Shakespeare in his evocation of something that demands the 'tribelesse, lawlesse and houselesse' of the *Politics* if it is to be described. This is not Aristotle, but it is Aristotelian and not merely in the orientation of its thought, I submit, but in actual imaginative ingredients; and it is the result

of an imaginative metabolism the stages of which will be hard to chart with precision.

The reading of the play that I described at the start, then, suggests that *Coriolanus* contains blood, bone, and sinew descended from the *Politics*; and, in turn, a reading of the *Politics* offers a confirmation of such an understanding of the play.¹ Whether I.D.'s translation is immediately responsible or not, though a matter of great interest, is not, I believe, of principal importance in this connexion. An acknowledgement of the resemblances claimed would contribute to what is of first necessity, once it has been decided that Shakespeare is worth reading, namely a true understanding of his intention; and it would be sufficient if we could feel sure that the intelligent, informed Elizabethan would bring to the play a mind tinged by ideas from the *Politics*.

Bacon's essay *Of Friendship* has an interest in this connexion. The interest lies in its explicit conjunction of the 'god or beast' idea with a discussion of human affection. It is, therefore, an example of this element of Aristotelian thought embedded in the consciousness of a contemporary of Shakespeare and in the same vivid form which I have suggested rests behind Shakespeare's play. I adduce it as support for my attribution of significance to the resemblances claimed above. At the least it means that we should not be surprised to find an Elizabethan seizing the notion and showing interest in its implications.

The interest is added to and given another twist by the presence, also, of a deposit of 'disease' ideas (a link with the play and with Plutarch) and of certain phrases which to me at least are reminiscent of the play. A further relationship may indeed be conceived. It may be thought that Bacon knew *Coriolanus* before he wrote the essay.

The essay was published in 1625 and is a completely new essay, though there is a short piece with the same title in the 1612 edition.² All of the pieces I shall quote appear for the first time in 1625. *Coriolanus* is probably of the last year or so of the first decade of the century and was first printed in the First Folio of 1623. Of Bacon's familiarity with Aristotle there is no doubt, and he begins the essay with the words:

It had been hard for him that spake it to have put more truth and untruth together in few words than in that speech, *Whosoever is delighted in solitude, is*

¹ Such confirmation is genuinely needed, for one cannot entirely rely on some supposedly purely literary sensibility. The language of a play, its poetic rhythms, its imagery, do not produce their effect unconditioned by the reader's own psychological and philosophical dispositions, the fruit of his own experience, the ethos which is the resultant of himself and his time. Our time is not Shakespeare's, and our reading can benefit much from historical assistance.

² For collation see E. Arber, *A Harmony of the Essays, etc., of Francis Bacon* . . . (London, 1871). I am grateful to Professor John Butt for drawing my attention to this complete revision.

either a wild beast or a god. For it is most true, that a natural and secret hatred and aversation towards society in any man hath somewhat of the savage beast: but it is most untrue that it should have any character at all of the divine nature.

There is no need to summarize the essay, though it should be said that his thoughts on the topic take a characteristically utilitarian turn. He employs St. Paul in 'For a crowd is not company and faces are but a gallery of pictures; and talk but a tinkling cymbal where there is no love', and continues:

But little do men perceive what solitude is, and how far it extendeth. . . . *Magna civitas, magna solitudo*; because in a great town friends are scattered, so that there is not that fellowship, for the most part, which is in less neighbourhoods . . . it is a mere and miserable solitude to want true friends, without which the world is but a wilderness; and even in this sense also of solitude, whosoever in the frame of his nature and affections is unfit for friendship, he taketh it of the beast, and not from humanity.

He next introduces the note of disease, with a typically practical application:

A principal fruit of friendship is the ease and discharge of the fullness and swellings of the heart, which passions of all kinds do cause and induce. We know diseases of stoppings and suffocations are the most dangerous in the body . . . you may take sarza to open the liver, steel to open the spleen, flowers of sulphur for the lungs, castoreum for the brain.

'*Cor non edito,—eat not the heart* . . . those that want friends . . . are cannibals of their own hearts' runs his celebrated pronouncement on the matter.¹ There follow:

A man can scarce allege his own merits with modesty, much less extol them: a man cannot sometimes brook to supplicate or beg.

A man cannot . . . speak . . . to his enemy but upon terms;

and he concludes with

if he have not a friend, he may quit the stage.

Apart from the quotation and immediate exposition of Aristotle and a measure of agreement of idea behind the essay, these instances are slight and scarcely coercive evidence, but at the risk of being over-fanciful I suggest that following upon a reading of *Coriolanus* they stand out from the

¹ To forestall suggestions rather than as evidence of influence, I would point out that 'cannibally' occurs in *Coriolanus*, and that 'enigma' and 'cymbal' appear in both play and essay. More interesting is Bacon's use of 'Comineus' for Philippe de Commines. According to Spedding's Index to Bacon's *Literary and Professional Works*, such latinization is rare in his English writings; and I have thought it worth meditating the likeness to 'Cominius' in *Coriolanus*. Thomas Danett published his translation of de Communes in 1596 (*Tudor Translations* reprints from the 1601 text), and uses the French form of the name except when quoting from Latin annals in his introduction.

page and take strongly reminiscent concrete shape. Coriolanus in the 'gown of humility' and elsewhere, Coriolanus visiting Aufidius, and Coriolanus finally 'quitting the stage' even, are what I have in mind, of course. And there is in conjunction the rich cluster of disease notions. The tenor of the essay is not precisely that of the play; its spirit of self-interest is indeed quite different from the sense of community, of the City, that is a feature of Shakespeare and Aristotle. It is the points which dramatic embodiment might embed in Bacon's mind that may be significant.

I would not now attempt to decide whether impressions from the play do indeed lie somewhere beneath the essay. What is most important is whether the essay does not suggest at least that its writer would experience the play as a piece suffused by thought and feeling springing from the *Politics*. If it does, then we are closer to the response of the desiderated intelligent and informed Elizabethan, and are the better fitted to comprehend the play.

THE SOURCE OF *THE EMPEROUR OF THE EAST*

By J. E. GRAY

THE first reference to the source of Massinger's *The Emperour of the East* was made by the playwright himself, who, when expressing in his prologue at Blackfriars the hope that the audience would favour his efforts, remarked that

Hee hath done his best, . . . though hee cannot glorie
In his inuention, (this worke being a storie,
Of reuerend Antiquitie).

Beginning with Gerard Langbaine,¹ men interested in the tale have referred more specifically to various old chronicles of the Byzantine Empire, but even Gifford has no information of real value. After mentioning data provided by editors preceding Gifford, Ireland commented that the plot is 'still to be sought for'.² In 1897 Emil Koeppl³ claimed that the basic plot was secured from J. Milles de S. Amour's translation into French of Zonaras's *Annales* and from the *Annales* of Cedrenus. With this theory Maurice Chelli,⁴ the French admirer and critic of Massinger, is quite in agreement, despite the fact that there are extant at least three other editions of Zonaras's history⁵ which should have been equally available to the dramatist prior to 1631. With this opinion remaining undisputed, no further question regarding the basis of the plot has since been raised.

Recently a new source for *The Emperour* was found; I am convinced that it is the only one used by Massinger. In 1626 there were printed in Paris two volumes of THE / HOLY COVRT. / or / THE CHRISTIAN / INSTITVTION / OF MEN OF / QVALITY. / *With Examples of / Those, Who in Court / haue flourished in / Sanctity.* / By Nicholas Caussin / of the Society of Iesvs / Written in / French, & translated into English / by T. H. / PRINTED. / at Paris, Anno Dom. / M. DC. XXVI. *D.N.B.* indicates⁶ that the third and fourth volumes of the translations of Caussin's work were

¹ *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets* (Oxford, 1691), p. 355.

² Gifford, *The Plays of Philip Massinger* (London, 1813), iii. 351.

³ *Quellen-Studien zu den Dramen George Chapman's, Philip Massinger's, und John Ford's* (Strasbourg, 1897), pp. 126-34.

⁴ *Le Drame de Massinger* (Paris, 1924), pp. 141-5.

⁵ They are: *Compendium Historiarum*, Basileae, per Joannem Operinum, 1557; *Historia Rerum in Oriente Gestarum*, Francofurti ad Moenum, S. Feyrabem, 1587; and *Croniques ou annales de Jean Zonare*, traduit par J. Millet, Lyon, M. Bonhome, 1560.

⁶ xxv. 226.

published in 1634 and 1638 respectively. The first volume,¹ with which we are concerned, was reprinted for the first time at Rouen in 1634; other editions were prepared after the date of composition of *The Emperour* (1631) and were published in London. The number of late editions is of no importance to this study except as an indication of the wide popularity of Caussin's work, which, according to *D.N.B.*, 'was for many years in great favour, especially among catholics',² a comment which will serve as further evidence for those Massingerians who believe that the playwright was a convert to the Roman faith. The T. H. of the title-page is Sir Thomas Hawkins, whose interests lay, among other fields, in music, literature, and the defence of Catholicism during a period when religious toleration was not being practised in England, this in spite of the never-ending efforts of Queen Henrietta Maria. Hawkins describes himself, in his dedication to the Queen, as 'Your Maties most loyall Sub- / iect, and Beadesman'.³ The motive behind the priest's work was to encourage the royal family and the nobility of France 'to erect the tropheys of Sanctity'⁴ within the court; more specifically, he writes in his second dedication:

I haue a purpose, when my leasure will permit, to diuulge the liues of Kings, Princes, Lords, Men of State, and likewise also of Queenes, Princesses, and Ladyes, who in the course of the world, haue flourished in much sanctity, beginning from the Court of *David*, and then concluding in our Age. . . .

For the present, because Reason should carry the torch before History, I will satisfy my selfe, with publishing this *Christian Institution*, which treateth of the Motiues, and Obstacles Men of quality haue to perfection, with the practice of vertues, most suitable to their condition; the whole attended by two books of Histories that very aptly contayne the good, and evill of Courts. . . .⁵

In his introduction to the fourth book of vol. i, Caussin refers again to his intention to write of the holy courts of the world; however, he reflects:

This volume already become big in the presse, requireth nothing but the seale vpon it. Behold wherefore I haue been willing to affixe it thereon, with two bookes of graue, and admirable Histories, which may serue as a scantling, of the whole piece I intend.

The issue of all this worke, is to declare a most worthy saying of *S. Augustine*: that nothing is so miserable, as the prosperity of the wicked, nothing so happy, as true, and solide piety. To bring those two verities into their full lustre of light, as well by example, as precept, I haue chosen two courts very different. The

¹ The four copies of vol. i known to be extant are located at the Folger Shakespeare Library; the British Museum; the University Library, Cambridge; and the Bodleian Library. It is through the courtesy of the Folger and the assistance of its staff that this investigation has been made possible.

² Loc. cit.

³ Sigs. **...v.

⁴ Sig. *2.

⁵ Sig. *3^v.

one, is the Court of *Herod*; The other of *Theodosius* the younger. In the one, the disasters of impiety are beheld; in the other the happiness of virtue.¹

It is with the second tale that we are concerned, for it was most surely read by Massinger in that 'harsher language, and ruder garment'² in which it was presented to Henrietta Maria by Hawkins in 1626.

On page 478 of *The Holy Court* we learn that Caussin obtained the data for 'The Fortunate Piety', as Book IV is entitled, 'from the Chronicle of *Alexandria*, *Zonaras*, *Sozamen*, *Raderas*, and others'. Caussin sifted the historical material offered by the older historians, accepting those episodes which helped most to depict the sanctity of the court at Constantinople during the first half of the fifth century after Christ and rejecting or abridging those events which seemed irrelevant to him. As one might expect, the achievements most admired by men to-day, such as the establishment of the University of Constantinople, the compiling of the legal code, and the expansion of the city walls, were not retained by a writer whose primary object was to illustrate the piety of ancient royal families. On the other hand, what details could be employed to greater advantage than Pulcheria's sobering influence upon the court of her brother, the conversion of Athenais, and Theodosius's forgiveness of his wife following the incident involving the fatal apple? Caussin selected what pleased him, just as scholars who thought that Massinger went direct to Zonaras and Cedrenus have believed the playwright had done. Massinger did choose and discard, but the material at hand had already been refined once, leaving for his perusal relatively few aspects of court life during the reign of Theodosius II. The material presented by Caussin represents the accumulation of nearly all the facts provided by previous chroniclers relative to those phases, plus Caussin's own interpretation, all of which provided for Massinger many more of the details employed in *The Emperour* than it has heretofore been assumed were furnished by his sources. Details of plot and character, parallels of expression, and unusual agreement in sympathy toward general and particular aspects of the period involved compel one to accept without hesitation the fact that Massinger's source was Hawkins's translation of 'The Fortunate Piety'. The work furnishes practically all of the details utilized by the author. Therefore it can be said that, with the exception of Massinger's introduction of a few common dramatic devices—such as the disguise of Theodosius as a monk—which were familiar to all of his contemporary writers, Massinger's sole source was *The Holy Court*.

It has not yet been possible to examine the first edition (1624) of *La Cour Sainte*, upon which Hawkins based his translation, for the only known extant copy is located in the Bibliothèque Nationale; however, a copy of the 1664 edition, the only French text known to be located in the United States,

¹ Pp. 386-7.

² Sigs. *-v. The phrase is taken from Hawkins's dedication.

has been inspected;¹ a collation with the 1626 version of Hawkins indicates that his translation is literal. There are given below several examples of parallel use of vocabulary found in *The Emperour* and in Hawkins's text which confirm the belief that Massinger employed the English translation of Hawkins rather than the original French text. This theory is enhanced by the obvious popularity of the translation; by 1630 it must have been familiar to most readers of normal curiosity regardless of their creed or attitude toward the influence of the nobility, both of which matters, in Massinger's case, would, according to the majority of critics who write about his religious and political tendencies, strengthen the supposition that the book found its way into his hands. Following are selected illustrations relating to plot, characters, vocabulary, and other details which uphold the claim that Massinger's source was 'The Fortunate Piety'.

Of the episodes described by the old historians, those pertaining to the marriage of Theodosius and Athenais, the lesson of temperance taught Theodosius by Pulcheria, and the fatal apple appear most prominent in Caussin's book; these comprise almost the entire plot of *The Emperour*. Specific similarities are discussed below, generally in order of their appearance in both the drama and the translation.

The eunuchs, chief of whom is Chrysaphius, are introduced at the end of 1. i (B2^v, B3) in such a manner that we realize that they are to play a sinister role in the forthcoming court intrigue; Caussin introduces Chrysaphius also at the beginning of his tale, and in a way that arouses our curiosity about the chicanery promised in future pages:

Amongst those who guided the youth of *Theodosius*, there was a certayne man, called *Chrysaphius*, a supple, and crafty spirit, who too farre insinuating himselfe into the fauour of the Prince, cast in the end some blemish vpon this fayre soule, and made worke inough for *Pulcheria*, as wee shall see hereafte [*sic*]. (p. 495)

Upon first seeing Athenais, Theodosius arranges to view her unobserved (1. ii, C1^v ff.). Caussin had written:

Theodosius vpon the report his sister made of this incomparable beauty, asked if there were no meanes to see her: *Pulcheria* answereth, she had giuen day to heare her cause. The Emperour, whether it were he vsed not to be present in such audiences, or whether he would heare her speake to her owne sexe with the more naturall propriety, fearing he should giue her too much respect, if hee presented himselfe in iudgement, made his sister to sit in the tribunall, himselfe resolving to see all that should passe through a secret window prepared for this purpose. (p. 499)

To provide the background of Athenais, both authors employ the same

¹ I wish to thank the St. Mary of the Lake Seminary of Mundelein, Illinois, for lending this rare book to the University of Maryland for my examination.

device: at the time Athenais eloquently pleads her cause before Pulcheria, she recalls the words spoken by her dying father while she relates his favourable premonition (I. i, C4^v; p. 496). In the play the conversion of Athenais is undertaken by Paulinus; Athenais's reaction is hardly encouraging. She replies to his 'Come my faire one, / I hope my conuert', 'Neuer, I will die / As I was borne' (I. i, D1). Caussin had written that Paulinus 'marueylously by his conference aduanced the conuersion of Athenais. In the beginning she was obstinate in Pagan doctrine . . .' (p. 501).

The marriage of Theodosius to Athenais (or Eudoxia, as the bride is christened) is briefly reported in III. i, in which Paulinus comments 'You may presume / No pompe, nor ceremony could be wanting' (F1-F1^v). Caussin also had dismissed the wedding itself as a matter of little importance: '... the marriage was solemnized . . . with all pompe correspondent to the maiesty of so great an Emperour . . .' (p. 453).¹

The major event relating to the lesson taught Theodosius by his sister involves numerous similarities. Most impressive is the terminology of the petition signed by the emperor, who says to Pulcheria after he understands the folly of his rashness:

. . . in expresse and formall termes I haue
Giuen, and consign'd into your hands, to vse,
And handle, as you please, my deere Eudoxia. (III. iv, G4^v)²

According to Caussin:

Pulcheria his sister to correct the negligence, resolved one day to draw a transaction, in formall and expresse tearmes, by which Theodosius gaue, and consign'd into her hands his wife Eudoxia, to use, & handle her at her pleasure. (p. 511)

Both authors tell of Theodosius's anxiety at the time of Eudoxia's first disappearance and of his impatience for her return once he learns that she is with Pulcheria (G1^v-G2; p. 511); both report similar replies from Pulcheria to Theodosius's command that his wife be returned to him immediately:

*She shall not come; she's mine; the Emperour hath
No interest in her.* (III. iv, G3)

. . . she [Pulcheria] persisting in her game, with a serious countenance, sendeth word to the Emperour, *he should not expect her*, and that *she was not at his command*. Theodosius was amazed at these wordes, and *could not imagine what game his sister meant to play*, hauing neuer hitherto knowne any such leuitie in her. (p. 512)

This recalls Theodosius's remark in *The Emperour*:

*What strange may-game's this?
Though done in sport, how ill this leuitie
Becomes your wisdom?* (III. iv, G4)

¹ This page is incorrectly numbered; actually it is p. 503.

² Italics throughout the remaining quotations are supplied by me.

To appease the victorious Pulcheria, the emperor, in the play, vows

heereafter

Neuer to *signe petitions at this rate*. (III. iv, G₄^v)

and in the tale 'promiseth he neuer more would *signe dispatches at this rate*' (p. 512).

The tragedy involving the gift apple introduces further parallels. Sending the fruit to his wife, Theodosius commands Philanax:

From mee *present* this *raritie* to the rarest

And best of women. (IV. i, H₃^v)

Hawkins says also that Theodosius 'full of ioy giueth her this faire *present*, which he had taken of the Peasant for a great *rarity*' (p. 513). Massinger relates that Paulinus, upon receiving the apple from Eudoxia and deciding that 'the Emperour only, / Is *worthy* to enioy it', sends it by Cleon to his master (IV. iii, I₃). Caussin tells next that Eudoxia sends the ill-fated gift to Paulinus because he 'was in bed sick of the Goute' (p. 514), which is precisely the explanation offered by Massinger for the queen's action (IV. ii, H₄^v). The matter of Paulinus's ailment will be discussed later. Caussin remarks that Paulinus 'so admireth the goodly fruit that he iudged it *worthy* of Imperiall handes, and . . . sent it to the Emperour' (p. 514). Theodosius's anger, graphically painted by Massinger (I₄ ff.), resembles that described by Caussin:

thereupon a furious ieaosity, as if it had been breathed from Hell, began to lay hold on this gentle spirit, all the objects of what was past returned to thicken the blacke vapour, to frame a cloud thereof, and resolue it into a storme. (p. 514)

This brings to mind the exclamation uttered by Massinger's hero:

what an earth-quake I feele in mee. (IV. iii, I₄)

The wrath of Theodosius is directed against Eudoxia and Paulinus equally. In *The Emperour* he fans all the dead embers of the past which suggest that Paulinus had been driven by opprobrious intentions from the beginning (IV. iv, I₄^v). Caussin, too, enumerates the circumstances involving Paulinus and Eudoxia which led to Theodosius's passion, concluding:

. . . all these conferences which euer had byn in the honour of an entire reputation, & which before cōposed nothing but hony, were all turned into gall in the hart of *Theodosius*, by this lamentable ieaosity, wherewith he was possessed. (p. 515)

In this connexion Caussin mentions another aspect of Paulinus's fate which may have had considerable influence upon the conclusion of Massinger's play, a digression from history which has perplexed many critics, but which no longer requires elaborate excuses:

Some haue sayd, nothing els followed, but the sequestration of Paulinus, and that should more pleasingly runne from my pen, which abhorreth bloud. (p. 517)

This suggestion introduced by Caussin was probably sufficient basis to provide the playwright with the happy ending that is typical of the majority of his dramas. In any event, as the result of his initial suspicions, Theodosius decrees:

*Hee's troubl'd with the goute, let him be cur'd
With a violent death, and in the other world,
Thanke his Physitian. (iv. iv, K2-K2v)*

Caussin had said:

the History sayth, the poore Paulinus, who knew nothing of that which passed, *was cured of the goute the same night, by a very rough, and most bloudy Phlebotomy,* for he was put to death, without any forme of processe. (p. 517)

The reaction of Eudoxia to her husband's accusation is the same in both *The Emperour* and 'The Fortunate Piety'; the oath she swears is alike in motivation (fear of Theodosius) and in expression:

By your sacred *life*, and fortune,
An oth I dare not breake, I haue eaten it. (iv. iv, K1v)

Eudoxia then perjures herself after the obvious scepticism of Theodosius over her first explanation for the disappearance of the fruit has quite confused the empress. In 'The Fortunate Piety' we read:

she who already was inuolued, tumbled herself further into the snare, and that she might not seeme a lyar, sware by the *life*, and health of her husband, she had eaten the Apple. (p. 515)

Once she realizes that her deception has lost her Theodosius's faith, Eudoxia remains silent at his threat ('Be dumbe, I will not waste my breath in taxing / Thy base ingratitude'—iv. iv, K2) and throughout the rest of the scene, except for one mournful exclamation at the very end. Could this effective example of dramatic skill have resulted from Caussin's line: '... for she becometh very pale, and was so confounded, she had not courage inough to speak one only word' (p. 516)? Caussin neglects to tell us what Eudoxia's word was, but could any other be more appropriate than the mournful 'Oh' supplied by Massinger?

And, finally, before closing the discussion of plot we return to Chrysaepius, whose machinations are primarily responsible for the reunion of Eudoxia and Theodosius, although the method and situation involved in the play differ from those described by Caussin (v. ii, L3; p. 524).

Since the parallels involving plot have been discussed in some detail—sufficient, I hope, to establish as undebatable the relationship between *The*

Holy Court and *The Emperour*—the following paragraphs relating to characterization will be covered in somewhat more general terms. Introducing Pulcheria, Massinger returns in 1. i to the 'build-up' method he employs so frequently; Cleon and Paulinus describe at length her training of and influence upon Theodosius; her success in establishing a chaste court and persuading her younger sisters to take holy orders; and her impartiality as a judge, this last quality being depicted by example in the second scene. The same attributes are discussed fully by Caussin, often in the same words (pp. 492-4). Caussin's phrases describing in part the training of the young ruler—'To be very mercifull towards the poore, and sicke', 'to make himselfe of an easy, & open access to the necessities of all', 'must establish his throne vpon two columnes of Diamond, Piety and Iustice' (p. 494)—probably suggested the 'naturall inclination [of Pulcheria] / To helpe th' afflicted . . .' (1. ii, B4); her admonition to Theodosius: 'Haue you especiall care too / That free accesse be granted vnto all / Petitioners' (1. i, B2*); and Paulinus's comment regarding Pulcheria's chastity 'being a rocke of Diamonds' (1. i, B2). Pulcheria's attitude toward corrupt court life is clarified by Caussin:

First, with an admirable wisdom she sequestered all those who might cause any vices to slide into the soule of this young Prince, well knowing no plague was so much to be feared in the Courts of great men, as to expose the ears of a child, to the hisses, and venome of serpents, which cast sinne into the soule, before they have eyes open to behold it, (p. 493)

resulting in the lengthy passages in *The Emperour* which involve the three corrupt officials who are banished from the court by Pulcheria (1. i, ii). Readers of *The Emperour* probably often lay aside the play, still meditating upon the dual character of Pulcheria. Her initial concern with Athenais is undoubtedly selfish; Massinger makes that point clear. Yet her sympathy for the queen at the time of Athenais's banishment and disgrace is genuine. Massinger portrays both the good and the bad qualities that constitute the character of Pulcheria, leaving us to wonder whether we are expected to admire or dislike her. On the whole, a favourable impression probably was intended. Speaking of Pulcheria's role at the beginning of the Theodosius-Athenais romance, Caussin directly refers to two opposing opinions of Pulcheria:

Politicians, who will measure all things by their own elle, & penetrate into the purposes of the whole world, iudged this manner of proceeding was a great discretion in Pulcheria, euer desirous to sway and possesse the spirit of her brother. She foresaw if he maryed some great Princesse, she might bring with the tytles and crownes of her auncestours, pride and disdayne into the house, and that so many Alliances as she might haue, might diuert Theodosius his mind on many

objects; that she being of high extraction, would rule without a companion, & therefore is [*sic*] was better still to hold the highest place in the government; That she could make choyce of some vertuous & handsome mayd, though of meane parentage, to frame her, as her creature, dispose of her where she best pleased, and then last of all conforme her to her own will.

Thus many iudged of others intentions, by their owne dispositions. But it is much more likely Pulcheria a creature wholly celestiall, guided herselfe by other motiues, the honour of God, Piety, Peace, and her brothers contentment; He already had signified to her, he would not captiuatue himselfe in an enforced, and cermonious mariage, and that he desired no other portion with the woman he should marry but Vertue, & beauty; which was the cause the Princesse supposed, this mayden was fitly sent from heauen in the tyme he was in treaty of mariage. (p. 498)

Scholars have long scoffed at Massinger's Paulinus, and reading about the young, handsome kinsman of the emperor in the old chronicles does incline one to ask why Massinger altered his character so. Now we can place at least half the responsibility at the feet of Caussin, for he first provided a gouty courtier; the castration of Paulinus, however, must be the result of Massinger's determination to convince his audience once and for all of Athenais's innocence; whether such a change in Paulinus is justifiable need not be argued in this paper.

A point of some interest is the peculiar spelling of the name of one of Theodosius's younger sisters; the double *c* in Faccilla can be traced to Hawkins, who writes: 'Theodosius was left an orphan with foure sisters Faccilla, Pulcheria, Arcadia, & Marina' (p. 491). Caussin refers to Flaccide; the older historians most frequently spell the name with one *c* and two *l*'s. In his discussion of Theodosius's early years as emperor, Caussin says (of the succession, one is led to believe): '... she [Pulcheria] was onely two yeares elder, then himselfe; one was thirteene, the other fiteene yeares olde' (p. 492), which actually is old enough to enable Theodosius to say

in my Fathers life I helde it madnesse,
To vsurp his power, (II. i, D4-D4^v)

without resulting in the anachronism Massinger is accused of by some critics who know, and think Massinger knew, that Theodosius ascended the throne at the age of seven.¹

Finally, there must be a brief comment relating to the alterations in his source material made by Massinger. The omissions of details present in Caussin, e.g., Athenais's kindness toward her brothers (p. 503), long passages describing Theodosius's piety (pp. 505-11), and events occurring after the banishment of Athenais to Jerusalem (pp. 522 ff.), can

¹ See Gifford, op. cit., pp. 274-5.

all be justified on the basis of irrelevancy. On the other hand, additions such as the trial scene, the discontent instigated by the eunuchs, and the chirurgion-emperick episode, illustrate Massinger's perennial interest in and battle for reform in the halls of justice, in the royal court, and in the medical profession; Massinger inserts this type of scene whenever the situation permits, and sometimes even when it does not favour a display of didacticism. The remaining alterations also require little explanation; the quarrel between Eudoxia and Pulcheria is merely a specific illustration of the cause for the hostility that Caussin says eventually grew up between the two women; the attempt made in the play by Pulcheria to persuade Eudoxia to refrain from all conjugal relationship with Theodosius unless he consents to be more discreet in granting petitions (III. ii, F3) brings to mind Aristophanes's *Lysistrata*, with which Massinger may well have been familiar. The disguise employed by the emperor was a common dramatic expedient used by many of Massinger's contemporaries; Chrysaphius's part in this incident has already been mentioned, as has one suggestion for Massinger's decision to inflict the good Paulinus with another physical tragedy; the playwright was apparently interested in eunuchs and the part they played in ancient civilization. He had recently completed *The Renegado*, in which considerable space is devoted to a discussion of castration and the position of eunuchs in high governmental circles. Although Caussin describes Pulcheria's attitude toward Athenais after the apple episode as distinctly antagonistic, the priest in other passages furnishes Massinger with sufficient evidence of Pulcheria's goodness to justify the loyalty she displays in *The Emperour* toward her sister-in-law (IV. iv, K2^v ff.). Several minor details have been altered (the omission of Marina from the list of characters, the introduction of further information relating to the will of Athenais's father), but these require no special explanation.

scarcely
a
discussion

It is hoped that the facts presented above shed sufficient light upon another long-closed chapter of Massinger scholarship to awaken new interest in a good play. At least the discovery of the relationship between *The Emperour* and *The Holy Court* increases our knowledge regarding Massinger's use of source material and recalls previous studies¹ which now might have to be reconsidered.

¹ e.g. Dr. McIlwraith's 'Did Massinger revise *The Emperour of the East*?' *R.E.S.* v. (1929), 36-42.

THE GAME OF OMBRE IN *THE RAPE OF THE LOCK*

By W. K. WIMSATT, JR.

THE writings on the game of Ombre, from the *Court-Gamester* of 1719 to Mr. Case's essay in *Texas Studies* for 1944, scarcely demand a full-dress rehearsal for the kind of analysis, in part summary, in part corrective, which at this late hour I should like to offer. It will be one of my aims, in fact, to point out that the several hypothetical reconstructions of a game of Ombre have exceeded the evidence of the game in the poem and to the extent that they have done so have had no critical bearing on the poem. Seymour's *Court-Gamester*, published only a few years after Pope's poem and derived from the earlier French authority *Le Royal Jeu de l'Homme*,¹ remains the primary and quite adequate source of information about the form of Ombre which Pope describes. William Pole's article of 1874 in *MacMillan's Magazine* is a lucid restatement of Seymour, with a temperate account of the game in Pope.² Lord Aldenham, in the part of his book that pertains to Pope's form of Ombre, follows the same lines.³ Mr. Fletcher's criticism of these reconstructions in *Texas Studies* for 1935⁴ rested mainly on the fact that he believed (for reasons to be discussed below under I) that the Queen of Clubs was one of the cards in play. Mr. Tillotson in the Appendix to his edition of 1940 gives the best modern account of the technicalities of Ombre and follows Mr. Fletcher in the matter of the Queen of Clubs. Mr. Bateson's critique of Mr. Tillotson in *The Times Literary Supplement* of 1 March 1941⁵ first raised the question whether Belinda bid the safer way of asking 'leave' and so sharing the privilege of a draw from the stock, or by the bolder and pre-emptive *sans prendre*? Mr. Case in his *Texas Studies* essay of 1944 offered refinements of reconstruction along the lines of Messrs. Fletcher and Tillotson.⁶

Among the correspondents who took issue with Mr. Bateson in the

¹ A. Pope, *The Rape of the Lock*, ed. Tillotson (London, 1940), p. 361.

² [W. Pole], 'Pope's Game of Ombre', *MacMillan's Magazine*, xxix (Jan. 1874), 262-9; recast in *The Cyclopaedia of Card and Table Games*, ed. 'Professor Hoffman' [i.e. Angelo John Lewis] (London, 1891), pp. 138-52.

³ [H. H. Gibbs], Baron Aldenham, *The Game of Ombre*, 3rd ed. (London, 1902), esp. pp. 91-4.

⁴ E. G. Fletcher, 'Belinda's Game of Ombre', *University of Texas Studies in English*, No. 15 (July 1935), pp. 28-38; cf. No. 16 (July 1936), p. 138.

⁵ F. W. Bateson, 'The Game of Ombre in "The Rape of the Lock"', *T.L.S.*, 1 March 1941, p. 108. Cf. the subsequent correspondence: 8 March 1941, pp. 115, 117 (D. Morrah); 15 March 1941, p. 127 (M. Summers); 22 March 1941, pp. 139-40 (G. Tillotson); 29 March 1941, pp. 151, 153 (D. Morrah).

⁶ A. E. Case, 'The Game of Ombre in "The Rape of the Lock"', *Studies in English* (University of Texas, 1944), pp. 191-6.

columns of *The Times Literary Supplement* during March 1941 was Mr. Dermot Morrah, who is a practical devotee of Ombre and beyond question has a more immediate and exact knowledge of the game than any other recent commentator on Pope's poem. A preliminary draft of the present essay having been, through the courtesy of Mr. Tillotson, submitted to Mr. Morrah, he responded with a generous commentary, from which, it will be seen at various points, I have been happy to adopt both ideas and words.

The rules of Ombre are complicated, but not all of them must be known to appreciate even the finest technical strokes employed by Pope in his poetic drama. As William Pole pointed out: 'This game is a simple one, requiring no skill to play, and is merely interesting on account of the poetical description.'¹ I should say that for anyone who would read the present argument with only the text of the poem before him, it is enough to understand the following: Belinda and her two male opponents play a three-handed game using forty cards, the tens, nines, and eights having been removed from the usual pack; each player holds nine cards, the other thirteen lying, at the start of play, as remnants of a 'stock' of thirteen and as discards made by some or all of the players between the bidding and the playing. In the single hand described by Pope, Spades are trumps, in the following order of strength: Ace of Spades (*Spadille*), 2 of Spades (*Manille*), Ace of Clubs (*Basto*), King of Spades, Queen, Knave, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3. The red court cards, as will be seen on the ninth trick, are stronger than the red aces. In order to win Belinda must take more tricks than her stronger opponent; e.g. five against four, or four against three and two. About the main outlines of the play—i.e. the location of most of the cards in play and all the important ones—Pope has left no doubt. I shall discuss the whole hand, alluding incidentally to the tricks in the order played, but dwelling mainly on four controversial points of interpretation.

I

Behold, four *Kings* in Majesty rever'd,
With hoary Whiskers and a forky Beard;
And four fair *Queens* whose hands sustain a Flow'r,
Th' expressive Emblem of their softer Pow'r;
Four *Knives* in Garbs succinct, a trusty Band,
Caps on their heads, and Halberds in their hand;
And Particolour'd Troops, a shining train,
Draw forth to Combat on the Velvet Plain. (37-44)

Mr. Fletcher read these introductory lines as referring specifically to the hand, or 'game', which follows as the main part of the episode. He adduced

¹ *MacMillan's Magazine*, xxix. 269.

this description of the court cards as evidence that all twelve of the court cards are in the hands of the players. But it would seem more plausible to take these lines as a general and preliminary description of what is going on at the card table. One might compare the description of the two kings Lygurge and Emetreus, their equipage and followers, which Chaucer introduces before the battle in the Knight's Tale. A few lines earlier (l. 28) Belinda 'swells her Breast with *Conquests* yet to come'. The plural number is here to be noted. Society gamesters did not sit down to so brief an action as a single hand of Ombre. 'The Gamesters', says Seymour, 'generally agree beforehand how many *Tours* or Stakes they will play, as ten, twenty, thirty, forty, more or less.' A *Tour* itself ended only when a pool was won and hence might last for more than one hand.¹ Lines 29-30 have given a general character of the three armies of cards—'Each Band the number of the Sacred Nine'. Lines 31-6 have described the concern of the 'Aerial Guard' for Belinda's cards when she is playing a hand—any hand. Then the lines quoted above continue the description, mentioning what is most picturesque, human, and significant, the twelve court cards—then the troops and the velvet plain. This is a descriptive epitome of the whole situation and would scarcely seem to warrant any inferences about the content of the particular hand to be played. It would, incidentally, be an extraordinary deal which put all twelve court cards in the hands of the players²—a deal which required exclamation, rather than the level expository tone of this passage.³ Such an advance description would, furthermore, somewhat diminish the interest of the ensuing play.

The technique of sliding from a general description into a particular incident is well known to modern novelists and short-story writers. This is Pope's technique in lines 45-6, where after the preliminary description, the focus turns upon Belinda announcing the trump suit of a particular hand.

II

The skilful Nymph reviews her Force with Care;
Let Spades be Trumps! she said, and Trumps they were. (45-6)

It appears unlikely that, as Mr. Bateson argues, Belinda plays *sans prendre*. The hand *as played* is strong enough to have been bid this way,⁴ yet it would be begging the question to argue that this proves that all the cards

¹ R. Seymour, *The Court-Gamester*, 3rd ed. (London, 1722), pp. 29, 33, 57.

² To make the record clear, let it be noted that I am here retracting my earlier opinion (*Mod. Lang. Quarterly*, vii. 118) that the passage in question does refer to the hands as dealt.

³ The passage cannot refer (as Mr. Fletcher, p. 29, thinks) to the hands held *after* the drawing from the stock, for Belinda has not yet named trumps. The *Court-Gamester* (pp. 7-8) is emphatic in saying that trumps must be announced before the drawing.

⁴ *Court-Gamester*, p. 40; Case, *Studies*, p. 192.

were held *sans prendre*. Mr. Morrah considers the *sans prendre* hand at Ombre to be distinctly the exception. 'In at least nine hands out of ten', he writes, 'the would-be Ombre asks leave; and where there is no clear evidence to the contrary the normal case may surely be assumed. If Pope's heroine were going to defy the lightning, surely he would give her unmistakable credit for her daring.'

What seems most to need stressing here is that the whole point has not much bearing on our interpretation of anything else in the game. *Sans prendre* let it be—or not. The form of bidding determines only what kind of assumptions will have to be made by those who would offer a complete reconstruction of the hand.

Even if Belinda plays *sans prendre*, the other two players have the privilege of drawing from the stock, and at least one of them, very likely both, will exercise it.¹ The poet then has omitted *some* details at this juncture, a fact which defeats any assumption that the game is completely described.² Pope's artistry depends, as a matter of fact, a good deal on what he has suppressed.

III

The play begins, and Belinda, leading³ her three invincible *Matadors* or highest trumps and then the fourth highest, the King of Spades, draws four of the Baron's trumps, including the Knave on the fourth trick. At the same time she draws from the other player two small trumps on the first two tricks, on the third a 'Plebeian Card' not further identified, and on the fourth the Knave of Clubs, or 'Pam'.

Ev'n mighty *Pam* that Kings and Queens o'erthrew
And mow'd down Armies in the Fights of *Lu*,
Sad Chance of War! now, destitute of Aid,
Falls undistinguished by the Victor *Spade!* (61-4)

Belinda has now finished her first winning run (one trick short of victory), and she is faced with the apparently crucial choice of leading her King of Clubs or her King of Hearts, either of which may be trumped by the Queen of Spades lurking, as Belinda has good reason to fear, in the Baron's hand. As this is her only real choice (outside the bidding), it is here if anywhere that we can assess the epithet 'skilful' which was bestowed on

¹ *Court-Gamester*, pp. 17, 19-21. Cf. D. Morrah, *T.L.S.*, 8 March 1941, p. 115; 29 March 1941, p. 151.

² Mr. Tillotson has pointed out (*T.L.S.*, 22 March 1941, p. 140) that 'there is no description of the pooling of the tokens'.

³ Mr. Morrah observes that we can tell 'that Belinda bid first—because she led the first trick. The first lead and the first bid belong to the player on the right of the dealer.' He thinks it furthermore likely that the Baron dealt, because the eagerness and immediacy with which Belinda plays on the last trick suggests that she does not wait for the third player, and that hence the Baron is on her left. Cf. *Court-Gamester*, pp. 13-15, 22.

her in line 45. For a student interested in observing the maximum of ironic nicety at this *peripeteia* in the heroine's struggle, the temptation must be great to say that the Knave of Clubs, emerging so conspicuously from a hand otherwise in the shadow, and accompanied by the phrase 'destitute of Aid',¹ offers a reason why Belinda should think that the third player is short in Clubs and hence that the Baron is more likely to have Clubs than Hearts. (It is 'fate', we are next told, which gives the fifth trick to the Baron.) Belinda's lead of the King of Clubs at the fifth trick will thus be plausible, correct, even skilful in the sense that it is not unskilful.

Unhappily, certain technical objections can be raised against this view. 'A knave of an outside suit', writes Mr. Morrah, 'is such an unimportant card at Ombre that it is very seldom that much can be deduced from the way it is played, and then only in conjunction with other factors, which are not stated in the poem.' In short, we do not know enough about the other cards (a point to be made more emphatic in section IV of this essay). Moreover, if we are to be technically, or arithmetically, relentless, we must face a further inquiry—whether there is in fact any *possible* distribution of cards where the Knave of Clubs could *helpfully* indicate to Belinda that the third player was short in this suit. We may observe first that if the Baron were Belinda's only opponent, or the only opponent who counted, it could not really matter whether at the fifth trick she led the King of Clubs or the King of Hearts. To defeat her 'singly' (see line 27), that is, to take five tricks and inflict Codille, he would have to hold not only the Queen of Spades but four winning Diamonds. And in that case he would be able to trump *either* Clubs or Hearts. We may observe secondly that the conclusion is only a little more complicated if we consider the fact that the third player, so far as Belinda can foresee, might intervene by capturing a Diamond lead of the Baron's. If he were to make the capture on the seventh or the eighth trick, and if he did not then lead back into Belinda's hand, he would nevertheless produce the 3, 2 division of the defenders' tricks which means victory for Belinda. If he captured on the ninth trick, he would produce the 4, 4, 1 division of tricks known as a Remise, a kind of secondary defeat in which the Ombre is said to be 'bested' and loses a stake.² But in this case, as in Codille by the Baron, the Baron would hold four Diamonds and so it would not matter what Belinda led at the fifth trick. Only if the third player captured on the sixth trick and

¹ Mr. Morrah thinks this phrase perhaps an allusion to the fact that the third player's trumps have been drawn. The phrase in any case doubtless implies not so much a privileged view into the third player's hand as the way things looked to Belinda over the board.

The Knave of Clubs has, of course, one overtly stated significance, the irony of his humiliation after the triumphs of Lu. But this need not rule out a further implicit significance.

² *Court-Gamester*, pp. 24-7. A 3, 3, 3 division of tricks is also a Remise.

then went on to produce the 4, 4, 1 Remise by taking three more Diamond tricks himself, would Belinda suffer an *unfavourable* outcome which depended on her leading the wrong suit at the fifth trick. But on this hypothesis, that the third player held four Diamonds, Belinda at the fifth trick could suppose even less about Hearts than about Clubs and hence would have no reason to prefer a Club to a Heart lead.

A determined defender of the significance of the Knave of Clubs will perhaps have to be content with saying that Belinda had scarcely so much time as ourselves to refine the calculus of probabilities, and that dramatically, if not technically and mathematically, the Knave of Clubs, so conspicuously heralded as a discard from weakness, advertises a certain plausibility in her next lead of the King of Clubs. Belinda, we shall have to admit, is a society belle and not a Culbertson. It is by the standards of the polite card table (not necessarily profound) that we shall measure her skill. She is no doubt skilful in her own esteem.

IV

The Baron, then, wins the fifth trick by trumping Belinda's King of Clubs. Next he 'pours' his Diamonds 'apace', winning with the King, Queen, and Knave the sixth, seventh, and eighth tricks, and drawing various discards from Belinda and the third player, of which we are certain about only one, Belinda's Queen of Hearts on the eighth trick. On the last trick, the Baron, instead of being able to lead another Diamond and thus administer to Belinda a complete defeat or Codille (or a Remise, if the third player should win the trick), has to lead the Ace of Hearts, which falls a victim to Belinda's King. Her victory has been only postponed by her choice at the fifth trick. 'The Nymph exulting fills with Shouts the Sky; The Walls, the Woods, and long Canals reply.'

Having now seen all the tricks, we are in a position to insist on the impossibility of a general and actual reconstruction of the three hands.

Of broken Troops an easie Conquest find.

Clubs, Diamonds, Hearts, in wild Disorder seen,

With Throngs promiscuous strow the level Green. (78-80)

'Clubs, Diamonds, Hearts' would mean literally or mathematically at least six cards, two of each suit, but means actually the four cards (including, we may say, at least one Club, one Diamond, and one Heart) thrown down by Belinda and the third player on the sixth and seventh tricks under the triumphant march of the Baron's King and Queen of Diamonds.¹ This

¹ The rout of disorderly 'troops', Clubs, Diamonds, Hearts, scarcely seems to refer back several lines (as Mr. Tillotson argues, p. 364) to the fifth trick. At any rate this rout could not include Belinda's King of Clubs, 'black Tyrant', who advances to the attack and is trumped by the Baron's 'warlike Amazon', the Queen of Spades.

fact well illustrates the degree of technical imprecision, or incompleteness, which is permitted by the dramatic demands of Pope's description. Of the forty cards in the Ombre pack, Pope tells us the location of nineteen: i.e. all ten Spades; the Ace (Basto), King, and Knave of Clubs; the King, Queen, and Knave of Diamonds; the King, Queen, and Ace of Hearts. The eight other cards in the players' hands include at least one more Club, one more Diamond, and one more Heart. But beyond that we can say little. That is, we do not know what the third player played on the third, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth tricks, nor what Belinda played on the sixth and seventh. One may suppose that after the drawing from the stock the three players usually held most and often all of the court cards. But surely they did not always hold all of them. In this hand we cannot be sure of the whereabouts of the two court cards not mentioned, the Queen of Clubs, and the Knave of Hearts. 'Within the limits of freedom allowed by Pope', says Mr. Fletcher, 'I shall *arbitrarily* assign cards and plays to each player.'¹ So in Pole's account one finds the phrase 'We will suppose',² in Tillotson, 'may be supposed';³ in Case, 'may have looked something like this'.⁴ But these arbitrary suppositions deal precisely with what the poem leaves unstated and unimplied and what is therefore no part of the pattern of the poem's artistic necessity. As Mr. Tillotson has well said,⁵ the third player's hand 'is left in shadow'. 'The technically clever thing' about Pope's treatment, says Mr. Morrah, is that he has thrown 'every possible ray of limelight away from Sir Anonym'. He has thus turned the usually triangular situation of Ombre into the conventional epic duel, a 'straight fight between Belinda and the Baron'. The reconstruction of this game of cards, 'filling in the colours and all the lights and shades', as Lord Aldenham put it,⁶ may be an agreeable speculation for a player of Ombre, but is scarcely a rewarding enterprise for a critic of the poem. Not total reconstruction, but appearance or probability, is what has a bearing on the elements of skill and fate in this game of Ombre and hence on its dramatic and poetic interpretation.

In this essay I have been concerned to show to what extent the technicalities of Ombre—both the transpired facts and the possibilities so far as they affect the drama of the heroine's skill and fortune—get into Pope's poem. The critic of the poem in its total poetic dimensions, not stopping with technicalities, will go on to speak of heroic combats, epic games, and the miniature epic simile where '*Asia's* Troops, and *Africk's* Sable Sons' are

¹ *Texas Studies* (1935), p. 30. The italics are mine.

² *MacMillan's Magazine*, xxix. 268.

³ Tillotson, p. 364.

⁵ *T.L.S.*, 22 March 1941, p. 140.

⁴ *Studies* (1944), p. 193.

⁶ *The Game of Ombre*, p. 78.

strewn promiscuous on the level green. He will point to all the varied ingenuities by which Pope has exploited the pictorial features of a pack of cards, to make both a technically acceptable and poetically significant visual texture, 'Particolour'd' and 'shining'. Pope's court cards meet the demands of realistic recognition, and at the same time, like actual playing cards, especially the full-length cards of that day, they are human and symbolic characters—the 'warlike *Amazon*' of Spades, the '*Club's* black Tyrant', unwieldy and pompous, the 'embroider'd *King*' and 'refulgent *Queen*' of Diamonds. 'The *Knave of Diamonds* tries his wily Arts, And wins (oh shameful Chance!) the *Queen of Hearts*.' Belinda pales and trembles at the threatened ruin. And the next moment she exults in her triumph—how precariously won! with what connivance of fate, for all her skill! And here is the prefiguration of actual downfall. For fate can take what it gives. The Baron has other weapons—'the glitt'ring *Forfex*'—and if he loses the tour of Ombre, he wins the canto. The game of Ombre expands and reverberates delicately in the whole poem. The episode is a microcosm of the whole poem, a brilliant epitome of the combat between the sexes which is the theme of the whole.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

A SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY GUIDE TO CHARACTER WRITING

IN *The Scholars Guide* (London, 1665) Ralph Johnson gives the following definition of *A Character*:

'A Character is a witty and facetious description of the nature and qualities of some person, or sort of person.'

He adds three *RVLES* for making it.

1. Chuse a Subject, *viz.* such sort of men as will admit of variety of observation, such be, drunkards, usurers, lyars, taylors, excise-men, travellers, pedlars, merchants, tapsters, lawyers, an upstart gentleman, a young Justice, a Constable, an Alderman, and the like.
2. Express their natures, qualities, conditions, practices, tools, desires, aims or ends, by witty Allegories, or Allusions, to things or terms in nature, or art, of like nature and resemblance, still striving for wit and pleasantness, together with tart nipping jerks about the vices or miscarriages.
3. Conclude with some witty and neat passage, leaving them to the effect of their follies and studies.¹

Johnson wrote this book for the use of grammar schools, and clearly believed that character writing was not too advanced for pupils at this stage. For, whereas he states that '*Ode, Satyr, Bucolick, Elegie, Emblem, Comedie, Tragedie*, are above the rank of the Grammar School',² among the models which he suggests should be consulted by '*the young scholar for his direction*' in various forms of composition, there appears the following advice: '*For Characters, see Blunts Charact. Overburys Charact. B^p Halls Charact.*'³

B. L. JOSEPH

THE READING PUBLIC IN 1803

THE *Appendix to a Catalogue of the Books in the Norwich Public Library*, printed at Norwich in 1803, gives a good idea of what books an enlightened purchaser thought a provincial public would, or ought to, wish to read. The total of books acquired, apart from tracts (for which see below), was over 200; and as the great majority were published between 1799 and 1802 they reflect the librarian's judgement of current literature.

Some gaps were filled, notably by the acquisition of *Paolo's Council of Trent*, 1696, *Gerusalemme* [sic] *Liberata*, 1617, *Usher's Annals*, 1658, *Freeholder*, 1758, *Farmer on Shakespeare*, 1767.

¹ P. 15.

² *Ibid.*, p. 41.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

The standard in general is high, but (as we shall increasingly see) not austere. The ancient classics are all but absent; I note only *Drachenborch's Livy*, 7 vols. 1738. Divinity, too, is less conspicuous than might have been expected; but I notice, in homiletic theology, Blair (the fifth and concluding volume), Sidney Smith, Wrangham, and Parr's *Spital Sermon*, 1801. The staple fare is largely history, biography, and travel. *Adams's Roman Antiquities*, *Gordon's History of the Irish Rebellion*, *Stewart's Life of Robertson*, *Bonaparte's Life*, *Carr's Stranger in France*, and *Vancouver's Voyage*, 6 vols., are typical of these classes.

In belles-lettres the latitude of admission is perhaps surprising. There are few novels, which one might have expected would be left to the circulating rivals. But I note *Belinda* and one or two even more frivolous books. The earliest English author is Chaucer; the undated entry *Canterbury Tales*, vol. 4 is obscure; perhaps the librarian replaced a missing volume of Tyrwhitt's five-volume edition. The rest is contemporary: Monk Lewis's *Tales of Wonder*, Hayley's *Cowper*, Bloomfield, Bowles, Chatterton, *Broomholme Priory*, Edgeworth's *Irish Bulls*, and *Woodvil John, a Tragedy*. Of modern foreign literature, apart from one or two translations, there is hardly a trace except *Memoires de Paisaye*, 2 tomes, and a Racine in three volumes.

Natural science is represented with dignity but not frequency, e.g. by *Entomologia Brittannica*, vol. 1, *Cuvier's Tableau Elementaire*, *Pultney on Linnaeus*, and *Skrimshire's Chemical Essays*.

In cataloguing his *Tracts* the librarian has achieved a classification on unusual lines. The library had added three volumes (64-6) of *Law, Polity &c.*: these mainly economic (*Guineas an Unnecessary Incumbrance*). The next entry is *Folio*, a volume of Acts of Parliament and the like, and is followed by *Theological Vol. 24* (chiefly sermons). We then sink to *Duodecimo Vol. 5* (*Experiment in Education, Why are you a Churchman?*). Then comes *Miscellanies Vol. 3* (political), *Quarto Vol. 5* (*Dodd on the Dry Tunnel, Parry on Wool*), *Poems, Octavo, 7* (ranging from *Gebir to Bubble and Squeak*), *Quarto, Vol. 10* (including Scott's *The Chase*), and finally *Plays Vol. 9*. We may be grateful to the anonymous compiler for a glimpse of the march of mind.

R. W. CHAPMAN

ARNOLD AND JOHNSON

'It always gratifies curiosity to trace a sentiment'; the only difficulty, especially with Arnold, is to know where to stop, and how to distinguish the unconscious reminiscence from the conscious quotation. In the elegiac poems the mood of recollection seems to make Arnold particularly

receptive to memories of his reading. The following is an instance from a famous passage of 'Stanzas in Memory of the Author of *Obermann*, November 1849'.¹

Arnold writes, when contrasting the troubled youth of his own generation with Goethe's,

in tranquil world was pass'd
His tenderer youthful prime.

But we, brought forth and rear'd in hours
Of change, alarm, surprise—
What shelter to grow ripe is ours?
What leisure to grow wise?²

Arnold's thoughts are with the 'tranquil world' of the later eighteenth century, to which he looks back with longing and almost envy;³ and 'leisure to grow wise' is the phrase of another writer of that age. Johnson, in the course of his comments on Pope's translation of Homer,⁴ had written:

There is a time when nations emerging from barbarity, and falling into regular subordination, gain leisure to grow wise, and feel the shame of ignorance and the craving pain of unsatisfied curiosity.

There is some likeness in the argument. Johnson's concern, like Arnold's, is with different periods of civilization and the progress of literature; the greater refinement of Virgil's world, and Pope's, justified their alterations of Homer; 'time and place will always enforce regard'. Arnold has just made it clear that to him, too, 'time' enforces 'regard'; he goes on to say that, therefore, Goethe's 'wide and luminous view' cannot now be attained; the children of this harassing age turn rather to the sadder sage of *Obermann*.

Arnold's own preoccupation with the effect of the time-spirit on literature would make this passage from Johnson especially congenial to him; but its context provides a special reason why in 1849 it might be fresh in his mind, for from that year comes our first evidence of his interest in the whole question of translation from Homer, in his comments on Clough's attempts.⁵ And in an earlier letter Homer is linked with Goethe and the

¹ First printed in *Empedocles on Etna and other Poems*, 1852. The date is added to the title in the 1877 edition, but 1852 has a note of it attached to l. 50, where Wordsworth is referred to as alive; and Arnold had quoted two lines from the poem in the letter to Clough from Switzerland in September 1849.

² ll. 67-72.

³ The poem has at times the elegiac tone of Gray, or of Collins in his 'Ode on the Death of Thomson'; indeed Gray's 'and leave us leisure to be good' ('Ode to Adversity') may also underlie the line in question.

⁴ *Lives of the Poets*, ed. G. Birkbeck Hill (Oxford, 1905), iii. 239.

⁵ *The Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough*, ed. H. F. Lowry (London, 1932), pp. 100, 103-4, 105 (March 1849). Cf. *Letters of Matthew Arnold*, ed. G. W. H. Russell (London, 1895), i. 11 ('I have within this year read through all Homer's works', July 1849).

Zeitgeist (which made him and his contemporaries first accept and then abandon the Wolfian theories).¹ The quoted phrase is, then, attached to a whole complex of reminiscence. And there would be no conscious distaste for the author to conflict with it, as with Arnold's echoes of (say) Tennyson ('one has him so in one's head, one cannot help imitating him sometimes . . . I should wish to alter such').² Arnold seems never to have wavered in his admiration for Johnson as a critic; in the year in which this poem appeared he was suggesting that Clough might write 'Lives of the English Poets from where Johnson ends—and in his method'.³ When he edited the *Six Chief Lives* in 1878 he had already regarded them 'for years past' as a *point de repère*.⁴

KATHLEEN TILLOTSON

THE BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

The British Quarterly Review was a sectarian review, but its wider range of interests and its more disinterested criticism distinguished it from the main body of sectarian periodicals. Its distinction was recognized by contemporaries: the *Spectator*, in which the principal periodicals were reviewed under the heading 'graver magazines', gave occasional notice to the *Review* as a magazine 'of the graver kind', and commented on the 'high average' of its articles; and even Matthew Arnold's disparaging reference in *The Function of Criticism* implied a recognition of the *Review's* authority and placed it in company with the *Edinburgh* and the *Quarterly*. Its individual character has been noted by Dr. Albert Peel in his introduction to a selection of letters addressed by notable contemporaries to Henry Allon, one of the editors,⁵ but in the studies of Victorian periodical literature the *British Quarterly* is not mentioned. It merits attention because, in recording their judicious opinion, the *Review* presents the standard and conception of culture maintained by the Nonconformists in that intelligent and educated section of the middle class which Emerson described as a 'perceptive minority' opposing and counteracting the 'practical majority'. The conception of culture and the criticism of the 'practical majority' offered by the *Review* have much in common with the culture and criticism later advanced by Arnold, and the articles on Arnold, presenting the reactions of perceptive Nonconformists, form one interesting feature of the *Review*.

The British Quarterly was founded in 1845 by Dr. Robert Vaughan,

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 86 (July 1848).

² *Life and Correspondence of John Duke Coleridge* (London, 1904), i. 211 (letter of November 1853).

³ *Letters . . . to Clough*, p. 121 (April 1852).

⁴ Preface to *Six Chief Lives*, p. xii.

⁵ A. Peel, *Letters to a Victorian Editor* (London, 1929).

President of Lancashire Independent College. Vaughan advocated tolerance and 'a more calm and enlarged habit of thought,' and condemned especially any form of narrow sectarianism. He claimed that the *Eclectic Review*, by giving its support to the extremist policy of Miall, had forfeited its status as the representative organ of the Nonconformist majority and had 'no right to complain if the majority resolve on having a representative of their own', namely the *British Quarterly*, which would provide 'a strong rallying-point to sober thinking and sober action among us'.² In the first years opposition was encountered from the *Eclectic*, but in spite of this and other opposition, and the numerous difficulties facing any quarterly priced at six shillings and appealing exclusively to 'the intelligence of educated men', the *Review* was soon established. It did not clear its costs and was dependent on a subvention, but this subvention obviated any need to lower standards in order to increase circulation, and the main object of the *Review* was achieved; in 1869 the *Review* made a justifiable claim to be the recognized authority on the views of moderate Dissenters.

Some of the contributors engaged in aggressive polemic, but Vaughan, who was the editor until 1865, set the predominant tone. His reasonableness is apparent in his article, addressed to non-Dissenting readers of the *Review*, on the characteristics of Dissent: 'we wish to deal faithfully with its good and not less with the evil to which that good is incident'.³ Although Vaughan set the tone he did not impose his own opinions, and contributors were able to select their own subjects, treat them in their own manner, and prepare their articles at leisure. The proportion of articles on theological subjects was remarkably small; the January number of 1872, for example, included only two, an article on the Bible, and a sympathetic account of Mohammed; the remaining articles dealt with Napoleon, Beethoven, Catullus, a seventeenth-century interior, the Education Act, and the Ballot Question. After 1870 the names of contributors were given; among them were Mark Pattison, Walter Besant, Vernon Lee, Edward Freeman, and Asquith. The political opinion expressed was that of Dissenters inclined to the Whig rather than to the Radical section of the Liberal party. The articles on science and philosophy gave an informed account of their subject, but were affected by the general intention of reconciling scientific and philosophic theory with Christian doctrine. The articles on painting, music, and literature were, however, usually unaffected by political or sectarian considerations. Nearly every number contained articles on subjects of literary interest, not only from English but also from French, German, and Italian literature, with one excursion into Chinese.

¹ R. Vaughan, *Congregationalism* (London, 1842), p. 60.

² J. Waddington, *Congregational History* (London, 1875), iv. 575.

³ vi (1847), 115.

The contemporary writers who receive most attention, and whose progress can be followed through the period, are Tennyson, Browning, George Eliot, Disraeli, Ruskin, and Arnold. Disraeli is not treated impartially, but the criticism of the others is well considered and disinterested. The articles on Tennyson indicate the standard of criticism. In the first the 1842 poems are censured for lack of human sympathies and for obscurity, but each poem is judged individually and acutely. After 1850 the Laureate's increasing popularity did not influence the reviewers' judgements and their criticism remained discriminating. They praised Tennyson's art:

in the art of language, the graceful rendering of thought, the elaborate music of his verse, and the pure tone of his sentiment, he is almost faultless,¹

but this praise did not develop into unqualified eulogy:

we are not of those who accept him as a genius of the highest order . . . he seems always to hold his subject at right painting distance . . . his charm is in his accurate expression of his tastes and feelings which are thoroughly adapted to our best English prejudices.²

The reviews are unsigned, but one of the later reviewers who can be identified is R. H. Hutton. He contributed an article on Arnold's poetry to the April number of 1872. Arnold, in a letter to Allon, has given his own opinion of the article:

Hutton has written and you have published an estimate of my poems far more careful, graver, and abler, than any which has yet appeared.³

The articles on Arnold's prose provide an exacting test of the reviewers' ability to free themselves from sectarian prepossessions, and they show a sincere endeavour to form an unprejudiced judgement. Most of Arnold's prose works are noticed briefly in the supplements of notes on recent publications, but *St. Paul and Protestantism* is reviewed at length, in two articles in the July and October numbers of 1870, and here the reviewer discusses Arnold's criticism of Nonconformity. He is ready to accept and respect adverse criticism, and on several points he admits, and even supports, the justice of Arnold's censure, but he objects to the injustice of Arnold's manner and method.

In both his criticism of Dissent and his social criticism Arnold's practice was at variance with his own precept of reasonableness and his professed aim of seeing the object as it is. He did not attempt to give careful and sympathetic attention to the case for the other side, and then base his criticism on cogent argument, but under cover of the impression of reasonableness produced by his tone and manner he quietly removed the

¹ xl (1864), 463.

² xl (1864), 463; xxx (1859), 488.

³ 16 April 1872; PeJ, op. cit., p. 171.

criticism from the sphere of rational discussion, principally by refusing to appreciate his opponents' motives and by parodying their opinions. Frederic Harrison asserted that he and others who were subjected to Arnold's satirical treatment regarded it as entertaining though ineffective, but the *British Quarterly* reviewer wishes to consider the criticism of Dissent seriously and reasonably, and it is apparent that from his point of view the method adopted by Arnold is, intentionally or not, neither persuasive nor amusing but merely provoking. The reviewer is especially irritated by Arnold's ironical and indirect manner of disguising the criticism as the advice of a candid friend, and remarks that he would prefer to receive the direct comment of a frank adversary. He persists, however, in his intention of forming a just estimate of the criticism. In examining Arnold's arguments he points out the several instances of dialectical injustice, and he clearly reveals the degree of misrepresentation involved in Arnold's practice of generalizing from a particular example by comparing the text of Winterbotham's appeal for measures 'to limit the operation of this unhappy sectarian strife', with Arnold's report—'positively the whole speech . . . strife, jealousy, wrath, contentions'. After dealing reasonably with Arnold's unreasonableness the reviewer turns with relief to the more straightforward discussion of the interpretation of the teaching of St. Paul. The reviewer's difficulties are understandable. Arnold's procedure prevents rather than invites reasoned answer, and another reviewer simply adapts Arnold's technique:

The type of religion presented by the present aspect of the English Establishment, its schisms, its party leaders, its lawsuits, its literary organs—the Church Times, the Church Herald, the National Churchman, et hoc genus omne.¹

The reactions of these reviewers indicate that Arnold, by relying on a method which was inconclusive and double-edged, considerably decreased the effectiveness of his criticism of Dissent.

Many of Arnold's comments on the deficiencies of the Nonconformists had been anticipated by the *Review* in the first years of its existence. The first number included an article 'On Morality of Party' in which the writer called attention to the dangers of the sectarian spirit. He remarked that any excessive adherence to party injured a man's mind, 'depriving him of that intelligence which a larger intercourse with other minds would bring'; and added that only by rising above the ideas of the party could a man achieve 'the harmonious acting of his whole nature'. Vaughan, in particular, had maintained persistent criticism of Nonconformist failings, and had endeavoured 'to stimulate dissenters in the amendment of some things in respect to which it is only too manifest that they still fall somewhat short

¹ lx (1874), 254.

of perfection'.¹ The *Review* set out to educate its readers and foster the growth of a critical spirit among them. Its educative function was later appreciated by Arnold in a letter to Allon:

I quite agree with you that the British Quarterly has a distinct and important part to fill: the old Quarterly and Edinburgh have no function other than to amuse a public whose intellectual growth long since stopped: the North British, Westminster, and your Review have the function of forming a public whose intellectual growth is going on or beginning.²

The importance of the critical spirit is stressed by the reviewers of contemporary literature in the numerous passages in which they move from a consideration of the particular work before them to a discussion of the general question of the uncongenial relations between the poet and the age. The reviewer of 'Bells and Pomegranates', for example, entitled his article 'Browning and the Poetry of the Age', and in explaining why the present is unfavourable to poetry he indicates the relation between the critical and the creative activity. He comments that, whereas in all the great epochs in the history of literature there has been 'an excitement in the public mind favourable to literature', in the present there is an unpropitious 'exhaustive spirit of application . . . a prodigious intellectual activity, but one not employed in opening up new tracks of thought'.³ Again, in the article on the poems of Elizabeth Barrett Browning, the writer estimates the effect of the conditions of the period on its poetry, and criticizes the tendencies of Victorian society; 'humanity rushing past us in breathless chase of what it holds to be the chief good . . . this is an age of sense as opposed to intellect'.⁴

The *Review's* criticism of the defects of contemporary society was based as much on cultural as on religious grounds, and before the mid-century the contributors were already criticizing Philistine standards. The limitations of these standards were noted in an article, written by G. H. Lewes, on Macaulay:

The first thing we remark is the absence of new ideas. He mistakes the nature of civilization. Railroads, representative governments, old port, tender mutton, are excellent things no doubt, and greatly conducive to our comfort, but thought shapes civilization.⁵

The enlightened judgements of the *British Quarterly* can be favourably compared with the comment of the *Saturday Review*, which was appreciative in its estimate of Macaulay and not critical of the standards he represented. A few of the *Saturday* reviewers, influenced by Arnold, did

¹ vi (1847), 115.

² vi (1847), 492.

³ ix (1849), 2 ff.

⁴ 10 November 1865; Peel, op. cit., p. 170.

⁵ ii (1845), 337.

offer some discerning social criticism. Morley was one of the few, but his articles did not appear until 1863. He contributed 'New Ideas' in 1865, and in the context of the *Saturday* his critical point of view was exceptional. Lewes's article had appeared as early as February 1849, and its opinions were in conformity with those already generally accepted by the *British Quarterly*. Similar opinions had previously been expressed not only by the reviewers of the poems of Elizabeth Barrett and Robert Browning but also by other contributors to the first numbers, and the *Review*, by 1849, had shown that its cultural horizon extended beyond that of the middle-class majority. It intended to correct the Philistine and Hebraistic prejudices of its readers, and to advance the idea of 'a perfect culture of the mind' dependent on an acquaintance with a 'wide sphere of thought and feeling—even of thought not assented to and feeling not approved of'.¹

The *Review* had a relatively small public. Its articles were lengthy, its tone was earnest and 'grave', and it appealed only to educated, serious readers, but its interest derives from the nature of its opinion, not the extent of its influence. It presents the views of open-minded Nonconformists on a variety of subjects, and it gives a representation of Dissent which considerably modifies that given by other sectarian literature. Its contributors were not tied to sectarian ideas and their thought provides a guide to the ideas current among perceptive Victorians. The relation between these ideas and those of Arnold is of special interest, and the *Review*, in putting forward a conception of a perfect culture, has a particular value for the study of the cultural standards of the Victorian middle class.

The *British Quarterly* was discontinued in 1886. Allon, who became joint editor with Henry Robert Reynolds in 1865, and sole editor from 1874, was an able successor to Vaughan, and the termination of the *Review* was due not to any inherent weakness, but to a decline of interest in quarterly publications towards the end of the century. The *Review* maintained its initial standard throughout its forty-one years of life.

R. V. OSBOURN

¹ ii (1845), 48.

REVIEWS

The Later Genesis. Edited from MS. Junius 11 by B. J. TIMMER. Pp. viii+135. Oxford: The Scrivener Press, 1948. 15s. net.

That a new scholarly edition of the *Later Genesis* was a desideratum need not be stressed, and Professor C. L. Wrenn (to whom the book is dedicated) was well inspired when he suggested to Dr. Timmer to prepare one. Indeed Sievers's edition (1875) has long been out of print, Klaeber's (1913; repr. 1931), designed mainly for seminar exercises, is devoid of any introduction, and if its notes are useful, they are very condensed. The poem has been adequately treated in Krapp's *Junius Manuscript* (1931) but it raises enough problems to deserve a separate edition. The present one, with its detailed introduction, full textual and explanatory notes, and complete glossary, will be heartily welcomed by every student: it leaves almost nothing to be desired. By a happy coincidence this text, which was practically revealed to the world by Franciscus Junius [who found for some years an adoptive country in the Netherlands and published the *editio princeps* (1655) in Amsterdam] now receives its most painstaking treatment at the hands of a Dutch scholar.

This edition begins with a copious introduction (pp. 1-69), in which, one after the other, are considered all the points connected with the MS., the text, its language, the date and provenance of the poem, its author, its relation to the OS. *Genesis*, its metre, literary fame, and hypothetic influence on Milton.

The description of the MS. is very thorough. On its history and the nature of the interpolation to which we owe the preservation of L.G., Dr. Timmer mainly agrees with what Gollancz said in the introduction to his full-size facsimile of MS. Junius 11. The reader will find a very clear study of the gatherings of the MS. which contain L.G. The explanations proposed by Dr. Timmer appear to the reviewer very convincing. The difficulty lies in gathering 2 and 3 where the beginning of the L.G. is to be found. Gollancz assumed that before p. 9 four leaves were lost. Dr. Timmer prefers to admit that three leaves are missing at the beginning of the quire and another leaf between pp. 10 and 11. God's speech to Adam and Eve may therefore have been originally much longer than it is in *Genesis A*. Dr. Timmer concludes, as Gollancz did, that the mutilation of the second gathering strongly suggests that L.G. was interpolated in the MS. for the first time, that the original of the OE. translation of the OS. *Genesis* was to be found in the monastery in which MS. Junius 11 was being copied, and that the scribe was told to insert a portion of it because of its high literary qualities. Following the conclusions of an article by Mr. F. Wormald in *Archaeologia*, vol. xci (1945), Dr. Timmer would revert to the localization of the MS. proposed in 1903 by Dr. M. R. James, viz. Christ Church, Canterbury.

What Dr. Timmer has to say about the Latin documents printed in the XVIth century by Flacius Illyricus (Praefatio A and B) should now be compared with Professor F. P. Magoun's article in *Mediaeval Studies in Honor of J. D. M. Ford*, pp. 127-36.

As to the time of the OE. translation, Dr. Timmer favours the view that the MS. containing the *Heliand* and *OS. Genesis* was sent to England 'in or shortly after 884-5, the year in which John the Saxon came to Alfred's court'. And indeed the linguistic evidence—studied at length pp. 19 ff.—points to the reign of King Alfred as the most probable period.

This brings us to Chapter II of the Introduction, where the reader will find the most complete survey of the language of L.G. that one could desire. A study of its grammar (phonology, accidence, and syntax) enables Dr. Timmer to distinguish in the poem three strata—early WS., Anglian, and late WS.; the translator's grammar was sometimes shaky, therefore if his faults have remained in this MS. (of the end of the tenth century) it seems safe to infer that the text was not much copied in the meantime. The few Anglian forms simply prove that the translator (or scribe?) was familiar with the traditional language of OE. poetry. The exhaustive and excellent study of the vocabulary of L.G. which follows (pp. 27-39) confirms the established opinion that the translator was an Old Saxon and not an Anglo-Saxon, and that he was acquainted not only with OE. poetry but also with the religious prose of Alfred's time.

A careful scrutiny of the numerous corrections to be found in the MS. leads to the conclusion—which differs from that of Gollancz—that the changes are 'from unusual or OS. or early WS. forms into late WS. forms'. L.G., according to Dr. Timmer, never went through Anglian hands; there is, he thinks, nothing to prove that the original dialect was Anglian.

Another important feature of this edition is that the text has been prepared from the manuscript itself (and not from Gollancz's facsimile, as was the case with Krapp). It is 'as close to the MS. as seemed practicable'. Every divergence is of course recorded in the footnotes in which the reader will find—for the first time—all the minutiae of the MS.

On the whole, Dr. Timmer's text is very conservative. Among his very few but happy emendations, one notes l. 274, *heah ran on heofonum* (in fact no emendation but a closer scrutiny of the MS.), which is interpreted 'a high dwelling in heaven', a sense which fits very well with the passage; l. 328, *englas oferhygd* is more plausible than Sisam's *egle*; ll. 486 f., Dr. Timmer prints the text as two expanded lines (as suggested by Graz and silently adopted by Behaghel) where other editors have three lines; indeed the alliteration is regular and the sense better; l. 701, *him* is also better than the reading of the MS. *hie*.

L. 444, Dr. Timmer offers a very convincing explanation of the spelling *hæleðhelm* (OS. *heliðhelm*) 'helmet which makes the wearer invisible, Tarnkappe'. The editor points out in his Introduction, pp. 25 f., that the phonology of the text is sometimes very similar to that of the Vespasian Psalter and characterized by a tendency to confusion between *æ* and *e*, with a preference for *æ*. The translator therefore may very well have rendered OS. *heliðhelm* by OE. *hæleðhelm* without being aware of the existence of OE. *heoloðhelm*.

P. 28, I do not see why Dr. Timmer connects the second element of OE. *hearm-scearu*, OS. *harmskara*, 'affliction, punishment', with OE. *scirian*, 'to appoint', and explains the compound word 'pain allotted to a person'. In fact *scearu* is directly connected with *scieran*, *sceran*, and often appears in compounds such as *land-*,

folc-, leod-scearu in the sense of 'division, portion'. Why not interpret *hearm-scearu*, as is I think usually done, by 'share of punishment'?

Finally, I regret Dr. Timmer's decision to print only a select bibliography. A complete one would have been welcome in a work which bids fair to remain the best edition of the *Later Genesis* for years to come. FERNAND MOSSÉ

Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century. By H. S. BENNETT. Pp. viii+326. (Oxford History of English Literature, vol. ii, part 1.) Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947. 15s. net.

The Oxford History of English Literature is organized so as to include Langland in vol. i, part 2 under the heading of 'Middle English Literature'; this has, alas, not yet appeared. The part under review lets 'olde thinges pace' and deals, as its title suggests, with Chaucer and his successors. I feel this to be an awkward division for students of a continuous history. Breaks, and (while the work is in publication) gaps, are no doubt inevitable; but one of the staggering events in the history of English literature is the fact that Langland and Chaucer were (within a decade or so) exact contemporaries, and both living in London. Both described their England, Chaucer with his secular courtier's vision, Langland with the vision of those lewd jots who pierce with a paternoster the Palace of Heaven. To divide these two greatest writers by putting them into different volumes of a consecutive history is to give the impression of succession, not of simultaneity, and to take away that binocular or stereoscopic view of a circumstance otherwise almost unique in our literature where two poets of towering genius, embodying all an old and all a new culture, overlap in time. The last forty years or so of the fourteenth century in literature *are* Langland and Chaucer, and any arrangement that obscures this fact seems to me unsatisfactory.

Mr. Bennett has tried by a few references to and quotations from *Piers Plowman* to overcome the difficulty of his task. At the other end of his work a like obstacle has faced him, namely, that Malory who by rights belongs to his period (the fifteenth century) has been relegated to the end of vol. ii, part 2, where Sir E. K. Chambers has dealt with him, though Malory has far more in common with Chaucer than with medieval drama, the carol, and the lyric, which Sir Edmund first discusses. Mr. Bennett seems to have felt this difficulty too, and has sought to pack in something of Malory in a chapter on fifteenth-century prose along with Margery Kempe, Pecoock, Caxton, Fortescue, &c.

Mr. Bennett has devoted some sixty pages to Chaucer. In his literary judgments he reaffirms established values; and, indeed, to say something that is both new and true about Chaucer's poetical achievement may by now be impossible. Much space is given to synopses of the poems discussed, which is bound to make dull reading, as it neither gives nor expounds the qualities of the original, save by an occasional epithet or descriptive phrase. I cannot agree with the view that Troilus's soliloquy on Predestination in Book IV should be 'given less weight in our second or third reading of the poem'; to me it seems of increasing importance at each reading, not only to the poem itself, but to almost all Chaucerian philosophising. Nor can I agree with his easy acceptance of the fashionable American

view that the B Prologue of the *Legend of Good Women* is earlier than the A. The fallacies in that position are too transparent.

Mr. Bennett's handling of the *Canterbury Tales* is sane and sober, and every reader will find a plain scholarly confirmation for his instinctive grasp of the main marvels of the poem. Some details, however, incite disagreement; for instance, I think it a little hard to describe the Reve's Prologue as 'a long-winded harangue' when it is among the finest pieces of poetical insight in literature. Later, however, he seems to retract this view where he says that the Reve's 'recognition of the coming of old age is wonderfully expressed'.

There are many informing passages dealing with the social background of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as one would expect from one of Dr. Coulton's most favoured pupils, and these are perhaps more valuable to the student of the history of literature than are aesthetic judgements, which most people like to make for themselves. But while I have ventured to differ with some of Mr. Bennett's aesthetic judgements on smaller points, others, for instance his discussion of Chaucer's diction on pp. 82 and 83, are very well observed. His point about Arcite's celebrated line in death, 'Allone, withouten any compaignye' (namely, that we moderns are more romantic about it than Chaucer was), is interestingly argued. Mr. Bennett could have strengthened his argument by pointing out that this identical line is also used to describe the normal night-life of 'hende Nicholas' in the Miller's Tale before he thought of Noah's Flood.

After reading the whole book I own to a sense of disappointment. It is not that Mr. Bennett's excellent and comprehensive scholarship is in question, or even that his perception of literary excellences, though generally just, seldom opens an unexpected window on his theme. I have felt myself driven back to the view that my disappointment is centred in the lost opportunities of a Langland-Chaucer volume. There are the flint and steel such as alone can make the real flash of history in literature, so the volume lacks fire.

NEVILL COGHILL

Chaucer's World. Compiled by EDITH RICKERT. Edited by CLAIR C. OLSON and MARTIN M. CROW. Illustrations selected by MARGARET RICKERT. Pp. xxii+456. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948. 30s. net.

This handsomely produced book, though apparently a lesser work than that originally projected as a memorial to Professor Edith Rickert, is still an impressive witness to her devotion to medieval studies and a reminder of some part of her contribution to them. Edith Rickert, it will be remembered, devoted much time between the wars to searching, and directing the searches of others, in the public records of this country for additions to the *Chaucer Life Records*. As a result she collected a considerable amount of material bearing on fourteenth-century England, and this material she and her chief collaborator, Miss Lilian Redstone, planned to use in a book which would illustrate, in particular, the life of Chaucer's own period. Edith Rickert did not, unfortunately, live to complete this work, and the preparation of the present volume (in essentials the book she had planned) has been undertaken by former students of hers, the

major part of it by the two editors, Clair C. Olson and Martin M. Crow, who are responsible for the final selection and arrangement of material. Wherever possible Edith Rickert's work has been preserved, and her hand appears, for example, in many of the explanatory comments which introduce chapters or lesser sections of the book, and in many of the footnotes.

Of the ten chapters into which the material has been grouped, the majority are concerned with subjects commonly presented in books of this kind, the Home, Religion, Travel, War, and so forth; a few, such as the first, on London Life, are of more specialized reference. As the chapter headings suggest, it was the editors' intention (and presumably Edith Rickert's also) to present a fairly comprehensive picture of Chaucer's world, and they have not therefore confined themselves to newly discovered material. Extracts are drawn from famous medieval books such as *Le Ménagier de Paris* or Froissart's *Chronicle*; others come from previously printed documents, a number of them from well-known collections, such as Riley's *Memorials of London*. Even the 'new' material has, in large part, been previously described, mostly by Edith Rickert herself. The value of the book lies, therefore, not in the discoveries it makes known, but in the selection of the material and the manner in which it is presented.

The plan of making Chaucer and the known facts of his life the centre of interest is kept well in mind and the majority of the extracts have a direct bearing on the social conditions with which he was familiar and the experiences which lay behind his writings. Included among them are, for instance, the account in the *Scalacronica* of the French campaign of 1359-60 in which Chaucer took part, and a description, from Froissart's *Chronicle*, of the jousts at Smithfield for which Chaucer, as Clerk of the King's Works, was responsible for erecting the scaffolds. Details of the duties and rewards of valets and squires of the King's Household are taken from various sources and there are itemized accounts returned by several persons, contemporary with Chaucer, for journeys made abroad on the King's service. The last chapter contains the wills of two men with whom Chaucer was associated, John of Beverley and Sir Lewis Clifford: and other documents, notably the account book of Gilbert Maghfeld, mention friends or connexions of the poet's. This account book, described by Edith Rickert in *Modern Philology*, xxiv, is one of the most important of her finds. It contains 'thirty to forty' names of persons known from other sources to have been connected with Chaucer. The extracts from it given in the present volume include notes of loans to, or debts owed by, 'Henri Scoggan', Henry Yevele, John Gower (probably, though not certainly, the poet), and Chaucer himself.

In the introductory notes and in the footnotes there are frequent references to further sources, other than those here printed, which have an interest for students of Chaucer. For instance, in a note on the homes of London citizens, we are reminded of the existence of the Gauger wills which describe the house of William le Gauger, the next-door neighbour of Chaucer's father in Upper Thames Street. This reminder, which occurs in one of Edith Rickert's own notes, will serve to indicate how alive she was to everything that could have concerned the poet. Indeed, her ability to enter into and to convey the life of the past (particularly the life of London) transforms many of her comments into

something much more vital than mere explanatory notes. Some of them contain interesting conjectures about Chaucer's works, as when, in the course of explaining the circumstances of the English invasion of Spain, she queries whether the story of Constance (the Man of Law's Tale) may not have been written for Constance, the daughter of Pedro of Spain, who had accompanied her father into exile and who became well known to the English through her marriage to John of Gaunt. Another conjecture of hers, that Gilbert Maghfeld was the original of Chaucer's Merchant, is recorded by the editors in their note on that person. Though these particular suggestions are not necessarily to be accepted, they and several others like them are certainly well worth consideration.

It will probably be clear from what has been said that this book, though it could have been produced by none but specialists, has much to offer the non-specialist: to be more precise, that it is peculiarly fitted to introduce university students to the age of Chaucer. This was foreseen by its compilers and, accordingly, the extracts have been translated or modernized wherever necessary. It must, however, be said that the accuracy of the renderings is not always beyond question. For instance, the exact meaning of two difficult lines (ll. 17-18; cf. p. 17 in this volume) in the alliterative description of blacksmiths may be uncertain, but the translation given here cannot possibly be right. Again, though there is something to be said for keeping fairly close to the originals, it is a pity to mislead those who may not know Middle English by retaining a word like *rent* (see p. 334), which does not mean what the modern reader will take it to mean. It might be further objected that the relation of the renderings to their originals varies too much, some being very free, others very literal. But it would be ungracious to stress these defects, especially in view of the editors' plea that 'errors and inconsistencies can scarcely have been avoided' in a book that has been so long preparing and in which so many hands have shared. In any case, they are heavily outweighed by the enlightenment which the book can bring, and the stimulus to further study which it will surely afford, to those who are interested in Chaucer and his works.

DOROTHY EVERETT

The Harley Lyrics: The Middle English Lyrics of MS. Harley 2253.

Edited by G. L. BROOK. Pp. x+126 (The Ward Bequest 9). Manchester: University Press, 1948. 10s. 6d. net.

This neat and competent edition of the lyrics from the Harley MS. 2253, long ascribed, on evidence which remains uncertain, to Leominster Priory, gracefully supplies a long-felt want and brings to the student of Middle English literature a wide variety of early fourteenth-century anonymous poems, secular and religious, representing the 'good, catholic, unconventional' taste of a contemporary anthologist. All the lyrics, properly so-called, are here except the political songs.

Professor Brook's useful introduction describes the manuscript and gives a careful analysis of the various types of lyric contained in it. It is perhaps, worthy of notice that the only purely comic poem in it, 'The Man in the Moon', is strongly native in flavour.

There is evidence everywhere in the collection of that delicate sensitiveness

to and sympathy with the moods of nature, and that easy command of language and form that distinguish the best in medieval English poetry. The high quality of the poems has long been recognized—and anyone who professes to know anything about the medieval lyric is familiar with 'Alisoun', 'Lenten is come wip loue to toun', 'Blow Northern wind', the 'Fair Maid of Ribblesdale' and the sombre music of 'Stond wel Modor, vnder Rode'.

Regarded as a group the poems reflect generously the literary tendencies of the time. They are, of course, dominated by the prevailing 'courtly love' tradition, the main features of which they reproduce, with some modifications. The juxtaposition of the two poems, one religious, one secular, 'Litel wot it any man', illustrates very obviously the sort of intimate cross-influences to which the poetry of the time was subjected.

The medieval lyric writers had abundantly the power of suggesting artlessness and spontaneity, and an inevitable simplicity—qualities we associate with the rich spring-time of verse. Professor Brook reveals the artlessness as conscious artifice and holds the subtle interfusion of humour and pathos, gaiety and grief so typical of these lyrics, to be marred very often by the medieval faults of lack of balance and the too frequent use of conventional phrases.

Many sides of medieval life find an echo here—hall and bower, greenwood and village, with its hayward—and as a whole the lyrics are as faithful a pointer to the life and thought of the time as the macaronic poem 'Dum Ludis Floribus' is a true indication of the state of the language.

Professor Brook's own admirable sense of balance does not betray him into any extravagance of enthusiasm. His well-documented book is readable and scholarly and a welcome contribution to medieval studies. The critical apparatus of Notes, Glossary (English and Anglo-Norman), and Indexes is carefully assembled. The glossing of *wodewale* as *golden oriole* requires further comment and deserves a note. Reference might have been made to the passage in Giraldus's *Itinerary of Wales* describing the note of such a bird which would seem to prevent the identification of the *wodewale* with the *heghwall*, hickwall or green woodpecker (A.S. *higera*, *laugher*). The Notes are models of conciseness, clarity, and caution. This editor's method is to quote the opinion of the earlier editors, Bøddeker and Carleton Brown, and consider it and the work of later commentators for re-emphasis or refutation. It is a pity that the mystery of the word 'amarscled' ('amarscled into the mawe') ['Man in the Moon'] must remain unsolved.

The Select Bibliography might have included a reference to the Translation of Andreas Capellanus by John Jay Parry, Columbia University Press, 1941.

BEATRICE WHITE

Essays on Primitivism and Related Ideas in the Middle Ages. By

GEORGE BOAS. Pp. xii+227. (Contributions to the History of Primitivism.)

Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948.

\$4.50; 25s. net.

This book, in its present contracted form, must be reckoned amongst the minor casualties of the war. In 1935 the author and Professor A. O. Lovejoy

produced a more ambitious volume on *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity*, which was to have been the first of four designed to provide an adequate corpus of literary texts, with running commentary, illustrating man's varying appraisal of his own history and destiny, throughout the centuries, in terms of general decline or progress or variations upon those themes, his recurrent discontents with civilization and yearnings for the simple life, or the reverse, and the theories of Nature underlying them. Unfortunately, for reasons explained in the new Preface, the Middle Ages subsequently proved too exacting for study and elucidation on the same scale. The further idea of a second volume limited to the Patristic period had also to be abandoned. Accordingly, we are left with a 'series of essays' by 'the junior partner', which are avowedly 'neither complete nor exhaustive' and give only translations from the numerous sources cited. For the great formative age of the Christian Church, the omission of secular literature, which our author deplors with equal frankness, is no very serious deficiency. That part of the task can wait. But, even so, a survey of medieval religious thought on the subject which stops short, in company with Migne's Latin Patrology, in the early years of the thirteenth century and omits such important schoolmen as Albertus Magnus, Aquinas, Duns Scotus, Ockham, and Wyclif can hardly be considered satisfactory.¹ The best that can be said of it is that it will at least suffice to introduce the novice to the general background of opinion and what it owes to classical as well as biblical influences, in so far as these can be disentangled from the syncretism of the times.

Although this more modest product has been relegated to a collateral series of 'Contributions to the History of Primitivism', it has not been given any Introduction of its own. Consequently, the reader who wishes to understand precisely what is meant by such terms as 'chronological' or 'cultural', 'hard' or 'soft' primitivism, and the like, must turn back to its classical predecessor. The new work starts abruptly with a brief exposition of the ideas of Philo, supported by relevant extracts. Here, in an American publication of the year 1948, one would naturally expect to see included in the list of recommended authorities (on p. 1, n. 2) the most recent study of this philosopher by Professor H. A. Wolfson of Harvard.² However, the date of Mr. Boas's Preface (1946) and the present delays in printing may, perhaps, explain the omission. Professor Wolfson has striven with much learning and ability to combat afresh the view of Philo as a 'Stoicising Platonist' and to display him as an independent critic of the prevailing Gentile systems. Nevertheless, for our present concern the fact remains that, in this gospel of Alexandrian Judaism, we encounter that Hellenic allegorizing of sacred writ defined by Dr. Inge as 'the sacramental method applied to history and literature',³ emphasis on the Stoic virtues of moderation and self-

¹ Among misprints I note, p. 8, ll. 32-3, 'Essences' for 'Essenes'; p. 137, n. 20, 'Mimms' for 'Minns'; p. 149, l. 40, 'Dindimis' for 'Dindimus', and p. 215, l. 34, 'sea' for 'see'. On p. 216, l. 3, add 'to be' after 'ordered'.

² *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (Harvard University Press, 1947), 2 vols.

³ (Art. 'Alexandrian Theology' in Hastings, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, i. 310). Of particular significance here in connexion with the Genesis narratives.

discipline, Cynic mockery of superfluities in food, raiment, beds, and other carnal pleasures of the day,¹ and even the ups and downs of Fortune's wheel ('For in a circle turns that divine *Logos* which most men call fortune'), all of which eventually become commonplaces of popular teaching and preaching in the Middle Ages. Accompanying these is an equally significant gospel of Toil, already versified in the *Georgics* (as Messrs. Lovejoy and Boas observed)² and later to be handed on by generations of Christian moralists to blossom again in the poem of Langland.

The two ensuing essays provide a lengthy catena of patristic and early medieval comment upon the state of Adam and Eve in Paradise, the cause and consequences of the Fall and its many problems, ethical and physical, a doctrine which frequently leads to a remarkable jostling of pagan and biblical ideas. Thus, under the spell of Euhemerism, even the Golden Age of Saturn, though distinguished from that of Eden, reappears as an epoch of history in the pages of Lactantius. Adam incorrupt is a Stoic sage to the eye of Greek Fathers like Gregory of Nyssa and Basil the Great; and whatever the late Dr. Coulton may have said about the dearth of 'classic praise of rustic life' in subsequent centuries, the spectacle of the earthly Paradise moves Augustine to raptures over the spiritual delights of agriculture and Maximus of Turin to declare from the pulpit, with an unqualified assurance which St. Jerome would not have shared—'It is therefore good for a Christian to hold rusticity sacred'. Since Lietzmann has taken the trouble to summarize the arguments of Irenaeus on the Fall and Adam's original condition, indicating the relevant passages in the *Adversus Haereses* and also the bishop's anti-Pauline notion of 'natural laws', it is all the more surprising that Mr. Boas has completely overlooked them.³ Instead, we are informed in an introductory paragraph on p. 15, the opening statement of which is further stultified, of course, by the very paucity of surviving records, that 'the Christians of the late first and the second centuries appear to have taken little interest in the subject. . . . It is not until we come to the end of the second century, in the work of Theophilus, that we find the question treated in some detail'. The name of Irenaeus, indeed, is not even mentioned in this volume, in spite of Professor McGiffert's explicit averment that 'he was the first of the Fathers to emphasize the fall.'⁴

For his account of the Christian attitude to the Cynic and Stoic doctrines of Nature and Natural Law, with which the next essay opens, our author might have consulted Troeltsch with advantage. In any case, reference should have been made to the *Soziallehren* in one of his footnotes, particularly in view of an English translation by Miss Wyon;⁵ likewise, to the appropriate chapters in vol. i of the Carlyles' *History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*. Again,

¹ Heard also, however, in the prophetic 'Woe to them that are at ease in Zion!', &c., of Amos and Micah.

² *Prim. . . in Antiq.*, p. 370.

³ Apart from Lietzmann, W. W. Harvey's edition of *Irenaeus* (Cambridge, 1857), vol. ii, Index of Words, s.v. 'Adam', &c., would have supplied the requisite hints.

⁴ *A History of Christian Thought* (New York, 1932), I, 134.

⁵ *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches* (London, 1931). See especially the important Notes to ch. i, on pp. 193-8.

a closer acquaintance with the treatises and homilies of the period would have cured him of his astonishment at the appeals to pagan authorities by Alain of Lille and Petrus Cantor and, doubtless, modified his conclusions. His final section here, too, on anti-intellectualism and 'the vanity of the arts and sciences', might well have been enriched by examples of St. Francis's hostility to book-learning and love of the *sapienter indoctus*. After a study of 'The Noble Savage', in which the several versions of Alexander's conference with the Brahmin sage, Dandamis, are set forth at some length, he proceeds to deal with 'Earthly Paradises' as revealed in equally familiar legends, such as those of St. Brendan, Prester John, St. Patrick and Tundale (Tnugdal) and the satirical *Fabliaux de Coquaigne*. The rest of the book is concerned with such evidence as can be found for 'anti-primitivism' and the slowly emerging concepts of progress and a progressive revelation, from the age of the Montanists to Joachim of Fiore, who occupies a concluding chapter all to himself. The contribution of Augustine and his doctrine of the Seven Ages to the birth of this happier frame of mind is not ignored. But, he who would seek to grasp the full significance of the Augustinian philosophy of history must certainly look elsewhere. For, as M. Gilson has expressed it in a notable Gifford Lecture, 'l'idée de changement progressif a été formulée avec une force extrême par saint Augustin et les penseurs chrétiens qui s'en inspirent. C'était une idée nouvelle, car ni chez Platon, ni chez Aristote, ni même chez les stoïciens, on ne trouverait cette notion, aujourd'hui si familière, d'une humanité conçue comme un être collectif unique, fait de plus de morts que de vivants, en marche et en progrès constant vers une perfection dont il se rapproche sans cesse.'¹

As an introductory primer, or, possibly a reference-book, Mr. Boas's volume will have its uses. Of greater novelty and interest, however, for the student of *les idées et les lettres* would have been a selection from the many later theological encyclopaedias and *homiliaria* which helped to disseminate these same doctrines of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church throughout clerical Latin-Christendom. A few hints for the fourteenth century will serve to show the kind of data available. Thus, Mr. Boas will discover, for example, in the widely circulated *Reductorium Morale* of the Benedictine Pierre Bersuire (Berchorius)² that interpretation of Adam as Reason (or The Spirit) and of Eve as Bodily Sense (or The Flesh) which he has quoted from the Pseudo-Eucherius and rightly mentioned as deriving from Philo.³ John of Mirfield, clerk of the Augustinian Priory of St. Bartholomew, Smithfield, gives us vivid accounts of both the terrestrial and the celestial Paradise in his *Florarium Bartholomei*. Among the marvels of the former, we learn that this fortunate land, basking in an ideal climate, without seasonal changes, and radiant with ever-blooming vegetation, enjoys two summers and two winters and trees that bear fruit twice in the year, because it

¹ *L'Esprit de la philosophie médiévale*, 2^{me} série (Paris, 1932), p. 188. Cf. further, e.g., W. Cunningham, *S. Austin*, pp. 114-16; &c.

² (Also styled Berchoire, Bercheur) Lib. i, cap. iii, fol. 3, c, in my copy (Basle, 1517), formerly Chas. Whibley's, and unrecorded by J.-Th. Welter in *L'Exemplum dans la litt. relig. et didact. du moyen âge* (Paris, 1927), p. 349, note 37; q.v.

³ Pp. 3 and 56-9.

lies upon the Equator.¹ The *Summa Predicantium* of the Dominican friar, John Bromyard, once again, stoutly maintains the old belief in a Golden Age of the past, followed by a progressive degeneration of nature as well as of man. 'In the beginning of the world', it explains, the earth offered ample room for its sparse inhabitants, who, therefore, had no cause to be greedy or pugnacious and knew nothing of the evils 'which now increase from day to day'. The race was also more long-lived and could 'attain the age of ninety years and more'. 'In modern times', however, with the straitening of bounds and possessions and the multiplying of the population, the earth now scarcely suffices for the latter. 'So, too, greed, avarice and malice grow so great that well-nigh every man assaults the other in brawls, law-suits and wars. So, too, moreover, the days of life decrease and the ages of men are shortened.'² Dealing with this same topic of world-decay in a later section of his theological dictionary, Bromyard adds—in words repeated in the contemporary 'C Text' of the *Vision of Piers Plowman*: 'In modern times, neither land, nor trees, nor waters are as fertile as they were wont to be' and, 'while fruits and good seed diminish and fail, ill weeds grow and multiply'.³ Robert Rypon and others trace for us, likewise, the sorry evolution of costume, from the first simple tunic of skins to the era of wool (also from the beasts), then of linen 'made from plants of the earth' and, finally, of silk 'fashioned from the entrails of worms'; others, again, the evolution of meat and drink, from the same primitive healthy beginnings to the current evil luxury and display.⁴ Let us hope that, with a happier issue out of our present afflictions, Mr. Boas may find himself neither 'too old' nor 'too ignorant' (as he puts it) to extend his researches into this fresh territory, duly linking them with the secular literature that has still to be explored.

G. R. OWST

Shakespearian Tragedy. By H. B. CHARLTON. Pp. ix+246. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. 12s. 6d. net.

Shakespeare the Dramatist. By U. ELLIS-FERMOR. Pp. 16. (From the *Proceedings of the British Academy*, vol. xxxiv.) London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948. 2s. 6d. net.

A Notebook on William Shakespeare. By EDITH SITWELL. Pp. xii+233. London, Macmillan & Co., 1948. 15s. net.

Professor Charlton, master in many fields of literature, is perhaps chiefly known for his writings on comedy, and when he says that the present volume of Clark Lectures is an attempt 'to say his say on Shakespeare' he is modestly overlooking the fact that that is a subject on which we are already indebted to him

¹ 'De Paradyso' (MS. Cambr. Univ. Libr. Mm. ii. 10 (2305), fol. 166; &c. A marginal note here in this manuscript adds: 'In Libro qui intitulatur Veritas Theologie').

² *S.P.*, s.v. 'Mors', art. xvi, 90. Bromyard informs us earlier that not one in ten of the population now reaches the age of eighty.

³ *Ibid.*, s.v. 'Mundus', art. i, 2. Cf. *Vision of Piers Plowman* (E.E.T.S., O.S. 54), Text C, pass. xviii, ll. 88-9. Langland here, however, puts the fault entirely on man: the ground, the sea, and the seed, &c., remain good, as in Philo (cf. the quotation in Boas, p. 6).

⁴ For manuscripts, &c., see my *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*, pp. 404-5 and 442; and cf. St. Basil, as quoted by Boas, pp. 111-14.

for much that is fresh and penetrating. But here he confines himself to tragedy, giving a chapter each to the four great plays but having much of interest also to say on the English historical and the Roman tragedies and devoting a page or two to the romances of the final period.

In the Introduction the author confesses himself a 'devout Bradleyite', and although he does not adopt *Shakespearean*, he follows and defends Bradley whom he regards as a 'natural psychologist' whose method is that of our greatest Shakespearean critics and has 'been traditional for over two centuries'. There is no doubt that most readers will regard this as the angelic side, wondering even whether the defence of Bradley is necessary. Professor Charlton will have nothing to do with seekers for hidden meanings: 'Shakespeare is taken to mean what he seems to mean. His meaning is public for all sorts of men'; and as for the 'meaning' of tragedy, for Shakespeare it becomes the 'picture of mankind's heroic struggle towards a goodness', and 'the painful sense of destruction' is alleviated by 'a growing sense of the immeasurable spiritual potentiality within man'. These and similar views are not far removed from the 'self-torture and self-waste' 'of a world travelling for perfection'.

There is much in the earlier part of the book which calls for discussion—almost always for extended expression of agreement. 'Tragedy . . . provides, not an illustration of what is generally held to be true, but a conviction that this or that must be true'; *Romeo and Juliet*, in spite of the richness and beauty which have naturally made it popular, is not a success 'as a pattern of the idea of tragedy'; Caesar is no Shakespearean tragic hero, nor is there sufficient excuse for his killing, and Brutus, 'in some ways, the prototype of Hamlet', is not Hamlet enough 'to mould the whole play to a tragic pattern'; 'In his comedies, the women are the shapers of their fate; in his tragedies the men.' These are picked at random, but tempting as it is to follow up such comments we must turn to the greater plays.

Professor Charlton will not accept the view that Hamlet does not kill his father because of his (Hamlet's) fine moral susceptibilities. Yet although it is easy enough to bring evidence from Hamlet's words and deeds which appear to show that he was not squeamish where blood and killing are concerned and that he could speak brutally to a maid, there will be many who will not place the same weight on this evidence as Professor Charlton does. The finely drawn humanitarian under stress may speak and act in ways utterly foreign to his character. And Professor Charlton is surely not justified in saying that 'As far as one knows, Hamlet, of all the women in the world, has known but two, his mother and Ophelia'. As far as one knows there were the normal number of women at Elsinore and Wittenberg and wherever Hamlet had been. It is surely wrong to suggest that he is almost a counterpart to Miranda. But there must always be argument about this play, as there certainly will be on Professor Charlton's belief that the impotence of Hamlet's will is 'nothing more than a fatalist's surrender of his personal responsibility'.

Professor Charlton follows Bradley in his approach, which Bradley described as being restricted to dramatic appreciation. But just as Bradley did go into other questions—particularly in his notes—so Professor Charlton spends much

time on sources. He makes some apology for this in the Introduction and it does indeed seem at times both that too many quotations are given and that, after the English, the original language is sometimes unnecessarily quoted. For example, in citing Cinthio, 'Some days after the theft' is immediately followed by 'indi ad alquanti giorni', 'One day after dinner' by 'un giorno dopo desinare', and so on. Professor Charlton is, however, excellent too on *Othello* and especially in his analysis of the love between Desdemona and the Moor. 'The lovers knew each other's soul in its pure essence; but . . . They needed to learn to live together.' . . . This, in ordinary household life, time forbade. There was only a spiritual chain between them and when Othello was stricken in the spirit because of Desdemona 'The cause, the cause itself, on which all human goodness depends, demanded her sacrificial murder'. The author rightly notes that Iago had motive (whatever Coleridge may say) and that malignity, which may often have no external motive, can—springing from an impulse to satisfy something evil in the spirit—there have motive enough.

The primitive force and living character of the natural background in *Macbeth*, its 'Egdon Heath' value, and the importance of the minor characters in supplying 'the play's universe with its surrounding moral atmosphere' are subtly brought out. There is, however, again perhaps too much source material—Boswell Stone's *Shakespeare's Holinshed* is drawn on freely—and too lengthy recounting of the plot; but it is good to find a scholar not afraid to emphasize that words in Elizabethan English could have meanings quite different from those they have to-day. The notes on 'the milk of human kindness' are good. The essence of the tragedy is summed up simply: Macbeth 'kills another man, destroys, that is, another piece of human nature. But, doing so, he destroys the human nature in himself.'

The worlds of *King Lear* and *Hamlet* are at opposite extremes. That of *Lear* is 'of a human society hardly emerged from the law of the jungle' and *Lear* is insane through part of the play, whereas 'Hamlet is one with ourselves of today, equipped with the nicely discriminating sensitiveness, the finer emotional susceptibilities, and the complex intellectual faculties of modern man' (an assessment which does not seem altogether to square with Professor Charlton's earlier view). This contrast of the primitive and the modern between the two plays is, of course, true, but perhaps too much is here made of it. Throughout the work the author has insisted on the *philanthropia*—the love in mankind—Bacon's 'secret inclination and motion in man's nature, towards love of others'—and the fact that but for this divine force there could be no realization of tragedy; and so in *Lear*, even though he asserts that the men and women of the play 'are and feel themselves to be near companions of the beasts' the effect of this force, in all characters, is well brought out. Professor Charlton believes that man and beast share with nature, 'that part of the creative activity which is generation, procreation. . . . But men alone, and not beasts, perceive its sanctity'. And hence the relationship between parent and child is 'the most naturally stringent of all moral ties' and the plot of *Lear* is 'a simple domestic circumstance . . . the breaking of the bond between parent and child' which 'grows easily into a more general theme of equal simplicity, life assaulted by the impact of sheer evil' involving

'all humanity in the tragic conflict of life' and maintaining 'as its persistent impression a sense of the nearness of man and beast'. The play brings out 'the ever-present sense of the universality of evil and of its power . . . of the hardness of the conflict to repel it, the pain and the suffering entailed, and the apparent uncertainty of victory'—Cordelia's death is sacrificial, just as was that of Desdemona. These Bradleyian and widely held views are expounded and illustrated with skill and scholarship but also with deep insight and feeling in a book which itself is not undramatic in plan and language. After the quiet opening of the first three chapters there is rise and fall until the main height of *King Lear* which is followed by something of a Miltonic ending in the Conclusion—a conclusion where rather less than justice is done to the romances by referring to them as no more than 'afterthoughts to the tragedies', as if they do not have a strong and individual character and meaning. But neither this nor any other criticism in this notice is of moment in comparison with the value of this important book.

Professor Ellis-Fermor's lecture is an exposition of the belief that of all dramatic poets Shakespeare alone is 'wholly and continuously dramatic'. That is to say, that by his vast, imaginative, impersonal sympathy, Shakespeare wholly and simultaneously identifies himself with each and every character in any of his plays, throughout the play, even in a character's absence. Miss Ellis-Fermor shows too that, however little we may see of a character, that little is always enough to convince us that the personality of the character is complete beyond the play—'living full and whole in the poet's imagination'. This simple but fundamental thesis is admirably presented with scholarly conciseness and lucidity.

Miss Edith Sitwell has written a book which is a happy and refreshing commentary on the plays. It consists partly of quotations from writers on Shakespeare but chiefly of Miss Sitwell's own feelings on seeing and reading the plays. Most of the plays are noted briefly but *Macbeth*, *King Lear*, and *Othello* have fuller treatment. The author's remarks are penetrating and wise as would be expected from so distinguished a writer who has read so widely: she speaks of the plays from many points of view and is always interesting, but never more so than when discussing the beauty of the poetry.

J. H. P. PAFFORD

The Satiric & the Didactic in Ben Jonson's Comedy. By HELENA WATTS BAUM. Pp. viii+192. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948. \$3.50; 20s. net.

Rhetoric as a Dramatic Language in Ben Jonson. By ALEXANDER H. SACKTON. Pp. x+182. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948. \$2.50; 14s. net.

These two books, published here almost simultaneously, view Jonson from very different standpoints. In Dr. Baum's work the emphasis is even more strongly on the didactic quality of his plays than on the satirical. The design of her book is not always perspicuous. After brief introductory chapters on Renaissance theories of poetry and on Jonson's theories of the moral and aesthetic values of comic poetry, she devotes most of her space to a recital of the treatment

of five selected objects of comic satire in Jonson's plays and in some other Jacobean comedies. Her intention has been to characterize Jonson by contrast with his contemporaries, but this plan is not fully executed, and the choice of Avarice, Lust, Drunkenness, Witchcraft, and the Puritans is not very happy, for as she observes Jonson does not attack lust or drunkenness except when excessive indulgence leads to folly, nor witchcraft except when it is an imposture. No clear picture of the central figure emerges from this treatment, and it tends to mask the constant objects of Jonson's attack, folly, and above all pretentious folly.

Dr. Baum is at her best in the short final chapter on 'Jonson's Achievement of a Dramatic Technique'. Here she shows firmly and lucidly the nature of Jonson's aims and experiments, the grounds of his dissatisfaction with successively rejected methods, and his progress toward the supreme achievement of *Volpone* and the great comedies. Here, too, she recognizes that

Jonson cared little for any vice in itself. . . . Whenever a folly or an evil habit usurped the place of a fundamental value in social life, Jonson was quick to attack it, not because he had any strong dislike for petty vices in themselves, but because unbalanced judgments gave them more importance than they deserved. (p. 147.)

This may overrate Jonson's social conscience and underrate his impatience with stupidity, but it is a firm statement of a view worth stating.

The text of Dr. Baum's book is well printed, but there are a great many inaccuracies of spelling and punctuation in her quotations; few of them are as serious as the omission of a line from a quotation from *Volpone* (p. 118), or even as the insertion or omission of single short words (pp. 77, 97, 118); they do not affect the argument; but they cause uneasiness.

Dr. Sackton explicitly rejects the study of the characters and of Jonson's philosophy in order to treat the plays as poetic dramas through a close and detailed examination of Jonson's language and the study of its place in a dramatic context, aspects of his art which have hitherto been praised chiefly in general terms.

Since formal rhetoric was part of the *trivium* of the universities, it is a fair claim that Jonson could expect a judicious spectator to recognize both the terms and the figures of the art, and to take pleasure in their use by and effect on the rogues and dupes of the plays. In four substantive chapters Dr. Sackton illustrates Jonson's use of Jargon and of Hyperbole in his earlier and in his mature plays, and shows how, by virtue of technical familiarity with these devices, situations of complex irony arise, wherein the words spoken may mean different things to the gulls and the cheats, to the stage characters, and to the audience, and how the spectators can even watch a cheat gulling himself by the hypnotic effect of his own jargon.

This and more of Dr. Sackton's criticism is of value beyond its immediate purpose. For example, there is wide application for his distinction of three stages in the use of hyperbole: the early Elizabethan (as in *The Spanish Tragedy*), where hyperbole in the mouth of a sympathetic character is used directly to rouse emotion in the audience; a later stage (as in *The Jew of Malta* and in Jonson's

own earlier plays), where in the mouth of an unsympathetic character it arouses no corresponding emotion in the audience but shows that the speaker is himself deeply moved; and the supreme stage, found only in Jonson's mature work, where the hyperbole does not express an emotion felt by the speaker, and the audience can recognize it as a rhetorical trick, though the characters to whom it is addressed do not. From the first (as Dr. Sackton notes, citing W. Schirmer) Shakespeare developed in his own way apart.

Dr. Sackton's exposition is good in almost every detail and excellent in many, but his generalizations leave me with an uneasy suspicion that he has successfully practised the art of rhetoric on me. Do his admirable painstaking analyses really tend to support his opening proposition that 'it is now becoming a commonplace of criticism that an Elizabethan play may be approached most profitably' in his way (outlined above)? Does it discredit other approaches to the poetic drama? Is the quality of poetic drama the only thing to be regarded in Elizabethan plays? Of course he shows his rhetorical skill by not affirming any of these propositions!

His fine analyses of language in single speeches or in longer passages of dialogue are not only valuable in themselves, but relevant to the discussion of some old questions, such as the revision of *Every Man in his Humour* and the additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*. And I do not recall any previous occasion on which I could end a review of a book by saying that I had noticed no misprint or misquotation in it.

A. K. McILWRAITH

English Emblem Books. By ROSEMARY FREEMAN. Pp. xiv+256. London: Chatto & Windus, 1948. 21s. net.

This is the first complete survey of the English emblem books to appear. Previously they have received attention chiefly from the bibliographer; Professor Praz, in his *Studies in Seventeenth Century Imagery*, touched upon Quarles, but treated him very much as an appendage to the baroque tendencies in which he was interested. Miss Freeman describes all the English specimens, including quite neglected ones like *Partheneia Sacra*, and attempts an estimate of their literary importance. She also goes outside the emblem books to examine the emblematic habit in general and its influence on poetic imagery.

The book falls into two parts, the first dealing with the beginnings of emblem writing in England, the second with the religious emblem of the seventeenth century, which gives the form its chief claim to distinction. First, an attempt is made to define the emblem by separating it from other varieties of symbolism. Use is made of the distinction employed by Shaftesbury in *Second Characters* between the allegorical picture which limits its symbolism to the dramatic suggestions of a possible scene from history or fable, depicting the natural passions of the participants, and the arbitrary emblem in which the figures have a literary significance bearing no relation to form, nature, or passion. Henri Estienne's classification of symbols into the intrinsic and essential, and the extrinsic and accidental, is also mentioned; it is noted that emblems were

generally of the latter kind, except for universal commonplaces like skulls and sun-flowers. Miss Freeman detects a difference in the treatment of the image between the earlier Elizabethan emblematisers and their successors in the seventeenth century. The first deal objectively with an encyclopaedic range of material, the latter are more subjective and favour emblems of a narrative type. After Miss Tuve's book on imagery, these observations are a timely reminder that, though Elizabethan and Jacobean were dependent on the same rhetorical material, there was a change in sensibility which caused them to apply that material differently. Peacham's *Minerva Britanna*, published in 1612, is properly included with the Elizabethans Whitney and Willet as belonging in spirit to the earlier period.

The fourth chapter, 'Emblems in Elizabethan Literature', shows the uses to which emblems were put both for rhetorical figures in school-exercises and sermons, and for designs in embroidery, plasterwork, and the scenery of masques. Their ubiquity illustrates 'the literary nature of contemporary decoration and the decorative nature of contemporary literature'. Spenser, who touched the frontiers of emblem form in his contributions to *A Theatre for Worldlings*, is seen as a major exponent of this earlier phase of the emblematic method. His images are based on the comparison of an object and a picture which are never identified. And his allegorical method is largely concerned with abstract qualities divorced from human nature, not with the doubting man but with Doubt itself. The transitions in *The Faerie Queene* from one type of allegory to another (e.g. from realism to abstraction in Malbecco) are paralleled by the mixture of, say, anecdotes and abstract devices in the emblem books. But of course, as Miss Freeman partly admits, Spenser has other sources for the allegorizing of psychological qualities; it is probably the decorative catalogues of personifications which are not really allegorical at all that owe most to the emblem habit.

In the second part of the book the author deals with the subjective religious emblems of Quarles, Hall, Harvey, and the Jesuits, with the cognate work of Herbert, and with the decline of the tradition. The last specimen chosen, Bunyan's *A Book for Boys and Girls*, shows a double degradation of the original form: from being a courtly game for wits and scholars, it has become at once an amusement of the vulgar and an adjunct to the horn-book. Emblems in children's books survived into the nineteenth century, but Miss Freeman has understandably chosen to stop at Bunyan, the last great writer in that allegorical mode which embodied and overshadowed the emblems.

English emblem books cannot compare in quality with their continental models, and as Miss Freeman points out, the nature of the form was prohibitive to first-rate poetic talent: the Alexandrian shibboleth, 'Ut Pictura Poesis', made the poet a slave to a picture which was itself a mere hieroglyph; the piecemeal recapitulation of symbolical properties produced verse that was fanciful rather than imaginative. It is not surprising therefore that some of the best critical writing in the book comes when the author escapes from her immediate subject to discuss the 'mute emblems' of Herbert, or the survival of the convention in the Interpreter's significant rooms in *The Pilgrim's Progress*. The defence of Henry Hawkins's prose is less convincing, and the chapter on Catholic emblem

books in which it occurs seems out of proportion, since Crashaw is hardly mentioned.

An appendix sets out the strong contemporary evidence for Hawkins's authorship of *Parthenia Sacra*, instead of Herbert Aston, as suggested by Professor Praz; it is also shown from internal evidence that the work is not likely to be a translation, and that the belief that it was is due to the ambiguous phrasing of the entry in Alegambe's *Bibliotheca*.

Miss Freeman's thesis on Herbert is, briefly, that he accepted the emblem method of point by point comparison with a picture, and succeeded where others failed. He is able to do this because his images are both visual and intellectual. Titles like 'The Collar' and 'The Pulley' are integral parts of their poems, taking the place of engravings. Mere superficial visual effects, as in 'Easter Wings', are less emblematic than the complex visual patterns in his best poems. The chapter on Bunyan, likewise, is less concerned to note the echoes of traditional emblematic images than to see what Bunyan's personality made of the emblematic method. His people are not personified qualities, but types created by the isolation of carefully observed tricks of speech and behaviour. His illustrations are simple and concrete, and fully absorbed into the narrative; the hieroglyphic world has gone; his snail is just a snail, not a page from the book of the creatures: he is already half-way to satisfying the taste of Lord Shaftesbury.

These chapters of literary criticism stand out above the rest, but Miss Freeman's whole survey is scholarly and perspicuous. She strikes a happy balance between the examination of a limited field and discussion of its implications. Her book is embellished with plates and has a full bibliography. ROGER SHARROCK

John Bunyan: L'Homme et L'Œuvre. Par HENRI A. TALON. Pp. xii+399. Paris: Éditions 'Je Sers', 1948, 700 fr.

This is the most thorough and fully documented study of Bunyan's work that has yet appeared, and will take its place as the most important contribution to Bunyan studies since F. M. Harrison's revision of John Brown's monumental life. Fifteen years ago Mr. W. Y. Tindall showed what valuable results could be obtained by an examination of Bunyan against the background of the literature of his fellow sectaries; but his scholarship was vitiated by a lack of sympathy not only with Puritanism but with the religious mind in general, which led him to depict Bunyan as an unscrupulous showman. M. Talon does not bring to his task Mr. Tindall's wide range of pamphlet information; he relies perhaps overmuch on secondary authorities: on Tawney for the Puritan social attitude, on Dr. Owst for the traditional elements in Bunyan's thought. But his general grasp of Puritan theological material is remarkably sound, and his intelligent sympathy illuminates the dark places of Bunyan's Calvinism, without minimizing those conflicts between the preacher and the imaginative writer where the latter has had the worst of it.

With the labours of the late F. M. Harrison at his disposal, he has wisely abstained from writing a new life of Bunyan. After a bare summary of the facts,

he passes to 'l'homme intérieur' and then to the books. All these books have an evangelistic purpose; Bunyan only put pen to paper to extend the range of his field-preaching according to well-established modes of Puritan rhetoric; and yet the prefatory verses to the First Part of *The Pilgrim's Progress* are a clear confession of the man who writes because he must. It is this tension between real piety and original artistic power which produces a work of devotion more typical of Puritan militancy than any a rigidly Calvinist schema would have provided, and a better book than could have been written by a man endowed merely with Bunyan's gift of realistic description. In Defoe the piety, now mechanical, and the realism lie coldly side by side, and are not brought into association; their union in Bunyan causes some blemishes (the anticlimax of the damnation of Ignorance at the end of the First Part is an instance) but provides the natural warmth that animates the whole.

This happy union is consistently achieved in *The Pilgrim's Progress*, fitfully in *The Holy War*, and is present in many of the minor treatises. In these treatises Puritan sermon method, with its minute subdivisions, reasons, and uses, is supplemented by the rural wisdom of an older homiletic tradition. As M. Talon justly says: 'Devenu un prédicateur à succès de Londres, il restait encore un enfant d'Elstow et de Bedford, un simple artisan.' Conservative in his social outlook, unlike many of the London Baptists, belonging, as Troeltsch noted, to the 'church-type' rather than the 'sect-type', Bunyan benefits, like Arthur Dent before him, from the inheritance of a stable way of life in a small community. 'Bunyan n'est visionnaire qu'à certains moments. Il est presque toujours l'observateur lucide et souvent amusé de la vie quotidienne' (p. 138).

However, M. Talon has resisted the temptation to dissolve Bunyan into the capacious entity of popular culture, or to see him as only another mechanic preacher. While admitting that his was a 'conversion puritaine classique . . . influencée par le climat spirituel d'une société' (p. 97), he fixes on the unique character of *Grace Abounding* as the key to Bunyan's individual greatness. The difficulty for poet or allegorist within the Puritan system was to find an admissible plastic form for the religious idea; even in the agonies of introspection, Bunyan has access to a world of concrete forms ('This sentence stood like a mill-post at my back', &c.). 'L'étude de ses sermons et de ses fictions nous montrera qu'il transpose son conflit intérieur, projette hors de lui les démons et les anges' (p. 107). M. Talon considers that the sparse style of *The Pilgrim's Progress* is closer to *Grace Abounding* than to the sermons which tend to cadences and rhetoric.

M. Talon gives an admirable account of Bunyan's conversion. He has an interesting chapter on the extent to which *Grace Abounding* can be accepted as autobiographical evidence, and a chapter on the controversial works and sermon treatises. However, as is proper, nearly a third of his book is devoted to *The Pilgrim's Progress*. On its composition, and on the old question of sources, revived in a new form by Sir Charles Firth and Harold Golder, he is content for the most part to summarize the findings of others. But to the analysis of the book as a work of art he makes an excellent contribution of his own. His comments on the prose rhythm, on the characters and how Bunyan's personality is

impressed first on Christian, then on Greatheart, are illuminating; so is the stress he lays on 'relief et mouvement . . . ces effets de dessin, de perspective' which knit the work together and make it greater in kind than a character-book. Unlike some English critics, M. Talon does not attempt to make out a case for *Badman* and *The Holy War*, but frankly recognizes their narrative faults. He might have assigned the cause of these faults, in the case of *The Holy War*, to the extraordinary complexity of the allegory, personal, historical, and millenarian.

Information necessary to introduce Bunyan to a French public tends to fill the book out, and it is to be hoped this will not deter the English reader. There are a few minor inaccuracies which require correction in a revised edition: Whitney's Christian name was Geoffrey, not George, and, a more serious blunder, Thomas Cartwright was expelled not from 'Margaret College, Oxford' but from the Lady Margaret Chair of Divinity at Cambridge. ROGER SHARROCK

A Bibliography of Horace Walpole. By A. T. HAZEN. Pp. 189. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948. \$12.00; 66s. net.

Ten years ago, in connexion with the Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's correspondence, Mr. A. T. Hazen undertook a bibliography of Walpole's writings and the productions of his private press at Strawberry Hill. Two separate volumes were required, since Walpole did not print all his books at his own press, and the works of many other writers were printed there during its forty years of intermittent activity. *A Bibliography of the Strawberry Hill Press* was published in 1942; and now *A Bibliography of Horace Walpole* completes the scheme. The new volume is a good deal shorter than its predecessor, and cannot be used without frequent reference to it; but together they form a Walpolian bibliography of the highest value. Mr. Hazen is the most scholarly and accurate of bibliographers, and in the collection of Mr. W. S. Lewis at Farmington he has had access to materials worthy of his abilities. The volumes are generously illustrated with facsimiles, and are designed in conformity with the stately Yale Edition, to which they will form an indispensable supplement.

Mr. Lewis in his preface, and Mr. Hazen in the introduction, are both a little apologetic because the new volume 'lacks some of the spectacular aspects of the first'. It is true that it contains nothing so exciting as Mr. Hazen's unravelling of the mystery of the thick-paper copies of Gray's *Odes*, or his inquiry into the misdoings of Thomas Kirgate 'the forlorn printer', which fascinated readers of the earlier book. Walpole's inclinations towards authorship were greatly stimulated by the establishment of his own press, which did not take place until 1757, when he was in his fortieth year. Before that date, apart from the *Memoirs*, which were not intended for publication in his lifetime, he had written only pamphlets and occasional pieces; and when, after 1757, his books came thick and fast, the majority of them were printed at Strawberry Hill and so do not figure here. But if the political squibs and pamphlets, so painstakingly described by Mr. Hazen, are less attractive to the reader than *Royal and Noble Authors* or *Anecdotes of Painting*, he is fully justified in claiming that the interest of this new

volume 'will be found instead in the history of Walpole's literary career, a man well aware of political and historical problems however much he emphasized mere gossip and occasional verse'.

And, in any event, there were several notable works which Walpole for various reasons did not print at Strawberry Hill. There was *Aedes Walpolianae*, his early catalogue of his father's pictures at Houghton, so crowded with misprints as amply to explain Gray's plaintive request about a volume of his own poems—'Pray . . . let me revise the press, for you know you can't'. There was that singular and much-controverted performance, *Historic Doubts on Richard III*. And there was *The Castle of Otranto*, printed by Dodsley with all sorts of pseudonyms and mystifications, and proudly owned by its author directly its success was evident. It proved by far the most popular of Walpole's works in his lifetime; and the list of its editions until the present day reveals, as Mr. Hazen says, 'a rather astonishing vitality'. A note at the end of the section devoted to *The Castle of Otranto* provides a striking comment on our own brutal age. 'A new translation into French by Dominique Corticchiato was published by his father, José Corti, at Dijon in 1943. The translator was only seventeen when he completed his work in 1941; he was sent to a labour camp during the German occupation and was not seen again.'

In 1798, the year after Walpole's death, the fine edition of his *Works* in five volumes was published. Mary Berry acted as editor, guided by Walpole's manuscript directions, and no doubt by the memory of his verbal instructions during the last years of his life. Walpole had begun to print a collected edition of his writings at Strawberry Hill as early as 1770; and on this edition, which was never published or even completed, the five volumes of 1798 were largely based. In subsequent years some volumes of Walpole's letters to particular correspondents, and the *Memoirs of George II* and *George III*, were published in conformity with this edition.

The section of 'Books with Editorial Contributions by Walpole' also contains some important items, and in particular the volume of Gray's poems with Bentley's designs, published by Dodsley under Walpole's supervision in 1753. Mr. Hazen devotes some excellent pages to this book, rather harshly described of late—he does not say by whom—as 'quaint and sometimes greatly over-rated'. In this section Gray's *Elegy* also makes an unexpected appearance, by virtue of the brief explanatory note which Walpole prefixed to the original edition; and other noteworthy books with Walpolian associations of this kind are Mason's *Memoirs of Gray*, Granger's *Biographical History of England*, and Gough's *Sepulchral Monuments in Great Britain*. Mr. Hazen provides a very useful list of Walpole's contributions to periodicals, which were more numerous than is generally supposed; and other sections deal with the books dedicated to him, the apocrypha wrongly attributed to him, and such of his manuscripts as still remain unprinted.

The partnership between Mr. Lewis and Mr. Hazen, in these two volumes, has been singularly fortunate. The treasures of the library at Farmington are only equalled by the admirable uses to which they are put; and the most insular bibliophile, after studying Mr. Hazen's bibliographies and the volumes of the Yale Edition, can hardly regret the prevalence in their pages of the brief but

conclusive statement, 'now WSL'. Mr. Lewis's great enterprise has been based from the outset upon close and friendly collaboration between American and English scholars and collectors; and Mr. Hazen's acknowledgements in his latest volume show how intimate that collaboration continues to be.

R. W. KETTON-CREMER

John Hales of Eton. By JAMES HINSDALE ELSON. Pp. ix+199. New York: King's Crown Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948. \$2.50; 14s. net.

When Lord Hailes published *The Works of the Ever-Memorable Mr. John Hales of Eaton* in 1765, how far did this title represent fact? It seems clear enough that by then the world had practically lost interest in Hales, and only after a century did his fame revive, when Tulloch dealt with him as first of the 'Latitudinarian' divines. Hales is a figure of whom we know hardly enough to assess his importance. During his lifetime he associated with remarkable men—with Suckling and Jonson, Chillingworth and Falkland; he helped Savile edit his great Chrysostom, he catalogued books for Sir Thomas Bodley. But, with all his wide learning, he wrote little. In his rooms at Eton friends came to him for advice. He gave the advice, and is now forgotten.

Mr. Elson has rescued all that can still be known of Hales, and it seems unlikely that we shall ever have a more complete picture of this retiring man. What Tulloch failed to do, Mr. Elson has now done: he has traced, from Hales's few sermons, tracts, and letters, the development of his thought; and he points out implications which do not always appear to have been realized by Hales himself. He was, it must be conceded, less 'profound and discerning' than Tulloch claimed. Mr. Elson suggests that, in 1617, Hales 'may not have been fully aware of the relationship of Calvinism as a theology and Calvinism as a theocratic system'. 'It is doubtful that Hales . . . realized fully all of the social and political implications of the Laudian program.' Like other humanists, he 'could but imperfectly understand' the motives of the man that 'rejoiceth in making sects'. Nor was he always able, as Tulloch had believed, to 'see clearly the drift of his own principles'. Mr. Elson thinks he 'was not aware, perhaps' of the short step from his own position to Deism.

Foremost in Hales's mind was the consideration of peace and unity within the Church. To preserve peace and unity, he shrank from committing himself on fundamentals. And he was driven on to treacherous ground. For instance, he was at one with Milton in upholding private judgement in religion; but they had different reasons for doing so. Hales never thought that controversy was a test of truth. He upheld the private judgement, because he disliked authority in religion. Placing his emphasis on reason, he tended to disregard revelation. Thereby he opened the door to the Deists. At the same time, though a stout Church of England man, he used several arguments in his *Tract concerning Schism and Schismatics* which came in very handy for the Dissenters in the next age.

Mr. Elson's study begins with a statement of the known facts about Hales's life. Then the Oxford sermon of 1617, on 'Abuses of Hard Places of Scripture',

is taken to illustrate the critical and humanistic mould of Hales's mind, and his irenic spirit. Hales is then related to a number of humanist predecessors in the Christian fold. There follows an illuminating account of the Synod of Dort, after which Hales 'bid John Calvin good-night', and came home a confirmed moderate. Next are given his views on the Roman Catholic doctrine of the infallible Church, and on Laud's ideal of authority, which, as Hales more than once hinted, was distasteful to him. (Laud, after reading the *Tract concerning Schism*, sent for Hales, who afterwards wrote him a conciliatory, but still firm, letter, and was shortly made a canon of Windsor. Whatever the archbishop's motive, it seems certain that he had no fear of opposition from Hales.) But if Laud distrusted his accommodation, so did the Puritans, while Hales looked on them as mostly men of 'green scholarship'. Next, Mr. Elson investigates Hales's *Tract concerning Schism*, contrasting it with the views of the second Lord Brooke and Milton. Finally, he discusses Hales's reputation after his death. It was in the Broad Church days, after the Revolution, that he was most appreciated.

The merit of Mr. Elson's work is the care with which he follows up every relation of Hales's thought to that of his age. Throughout, he makes clear and well-founded distinctions. Unfortunately, less care has gone into proof-reading. There are quite a few inaccuracies, e.g. 'Glanvil' (p. 30); '*pacem ecclesiasticum*' (p. 60); 'cancatenated' (p. 66); 'Arminus' (p. 75); and, on p. 28, 'Shadow of my Phantie', from a manuscript in the British Museum, looks suspect. There is also some ugly writing in places ('pro-Contra-Remonstrant' and other technicalities). But in general Mr. Elson has served Hales well. Though scarcely to be reckoned with as a man of letters, Hales is more worthy of attention than most scholars or divines of that age, if only because his dilemma has its modern counterpart. Mr. Elson claims that Hales's was a 'valid attitude' even for our time. One might remark that if Hales's career proves anything, it is that the middle way is beset with dangers.

HENRY GIFFORD

A Preface to Eighteenth Century Poetry. By JAMES SUTHERLAND. Pp. viii+176. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948. 12s. 6d. net.

The reviewer faced with Professor Sutherland's *Preface* is in an agreeable situation—he can praise without hypocrisy and without reserve. It is not a history and will not, therefore, describe to an uninformed reader how to take the poets in an orderly sequence, or what to select from each one. But no better-informed or more humane counsellor than Professor Sutherland exists to explain the critical equipment necessary for the proper appreciation of eighteenth-century poetry, or of the conditions within which the poets had to work unless they accepted the risk of being considered (to quote the title of the last chapter) 'Truants and Rebels'.

Everything about the *Preface* is a source of pleasure. In a world where books are often too long, and time always too short, it is modest in compass. At a time when criticism is often pretentious and scholarship often pedestrian it is beautifully sensible, wonderfully well-informed, and admirably written. It is full of thought and concentrated in significance, yet there is no sense of congestion and

it may be read (indeed, through its quality of irresistible attractiveness, is read) with easy enjoyment. It is a book of admirable good manners, and treats the reader with the utmost consideration. It is grounded on intimate knowledge (from its author this goes almost without saying), and it weaves that knowledge together in a pattern at once complex and clear. For one example from many one might select three pages (97-9) of discussion about prevailing attitudes towards humble and rustic life. Here, in short space, Goldsmith, Johnson, Wordsworth, Hume, Pope, Gay, Chesterfield, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, Burke, Walpole, and Ambrose Philips are brought together to present their opinions, throwing light on the subject naturally and easily, not crowded in or ostentatiously on display. The air—and it is that of the whole book—is of a circle of friends talking, each chiming in aptly with his own point of view. This sense of intimate reality is a most appealing thing, and it is the most satisfying of signs that the material all coexists simultaneously in the writer's mind, fully explored, ordered, clarified, and made coherent. It is a wealth of substance which in a less sensitive scholar might have been merely an accumulation of detail but which here is a fine organization of relevant knowledge.

It is part of the book's critical penetration that it gets close to the central facts about eighteenth-century poetry without forgetting that it *is* poetry and not illustrative documentation. For instance, it is easy to feel the century's liking for generality of expression, but not so easy to go farther and distinguish between higher and lower forms of generality corresponding to truly and falsely 'ideal' conceptions of the subject. It is easy likewise to see the infrequency in the century of outbursts of individual emotion, but not so easy to gain a sympathetic understanding of this fact. And it is easy to see that eighteenth-century poetry 'was regarded as an art; the art of making poems', but not so easy to present so perceptive an account of its successes and failures as to make us live again for a while within the outlook that desired things thus, without losing our more experienced sense that there are further things we seek in poetry. It is a sign of the balance in the book that the writer can look both with the Wordsworthian eyesight most of us have acquired, and which makes the eighteenth century seem artificial, and with the eighteenth-century eyesight most of us have lost, which makes Wordsworth seem so surprising.

There is perhaps one minor respect in which one feels a slight insufficiency. The chapter on 'Truants and Rebels' might well have been longer, so that the ordinary reader could glimpse rather more of the things that went on beyond the limited horizons of eighteenth-century 'normality'. Without always being rebels, the truants from normality were rather numerous. In many incidental references Professor Sutherland makes this clear, yet the point might have been dwelt on further. Savage with his ferocious egotism, with the strong, abrupt, angular effects of *The Wanderer* (its force decidedly alien to the regular modes of poetic sensibility, and its material furnished with picturesque landscapes and oppressed griefs like a superlatively masculine version of 'Eloisa to Abelard'): Falconer with his Mediterranean seascapes, waterspouts, dying dolphins, and nautical terms: Mallet whose *Excursion* is praised by Savage and who had read to good effect his Martin's *Voyage to St. Kilda*: the interesting vogue of 'cosmic'

poems (the Shaftesburian rhapsodies of *The Seasons*, for instance, and the world-wide sweeps of eye in Savage and Akenside): the release of imagination through the wonders of astronomy (Addison and Akenside); and the power of religious experience either in these scientific raptures or in the many fine pages of eighteenth-century hymnody—one refers to these things diffidently as deserving more stress. Certain of them are touched on incidentally—Savage and Mallet as writers of descriptive poems, for instance. Yet a slightly wider cast of net would have made this last chapter better. As Professor Sutherland observes, 'the taste for mountains and cataracts, for tempest and floods, for the turbulence of stormy seas and the tortured and fractured surfaces of the earth, has been rightly associated with romanticism'. Yet all these things were prominent in the eighteenth century—there are vigorous storms in Thomson, Mallet, and Falconer, and storms are phenomena diametrically opposed to the century's poetic 'normality'. There was, too, the taste which made *The Arabian Nights* so popular and prompted Ambrose Philips 'to turn a Persian tale for half a crown' and Collins to write his *Eclogues*. The note to Eclogue II declares it to possess 'all the advantages that any species of poetry can derive from the novelty of the subject and scenery', and though the claim is doubtful it points to an extension of taste fruitful in the applied arts as well as in literature. That slight minimizing of the truant dispositions is, however, the only criticism one would make of the plan, contents, and proportions of an indispensable book.

A. R. HUMPHREYS

George Eliot. Her Mind and Her Art. By JOAN BENNETT. Pp. xvi+203. Cambridge University Press, 1948. 10s. 6d. net.

Mrs. Bennett's book is in two parts: the first deals with George Eliot's 'intellectual and emotional development', the second with the novels. In the first section, which seems to me the more interesting and successful, Mrs. Bennett is concerned mainly—though not exclusively—with two issues: George Eliot's conversion from evangelical Christianity to religious agnosticism and the significance of her relationship with G. H. Lewes. Of these two questions the first is the more fully and convincingly treated; as regards the second, Mrs. Bennett is concerned to do no more than establish, chiefly through the letters, that George Eliot's decision to live with Lewes was a mature and rational one which, though (naturally enough) deeply felt and pondered, resulted for her in no unbalancing neurosis or moral fanaticism.

This part of the book is most judiciously done. Mrs. Bennett does not present us with new facts, but she marshals her material with sympathy and a sound and sensitive judgement. There seems here to be the real 'feel' of George Eliot, a portrait which convinces and satisfies because there emerges the woman who could have written the books, with their strength and weaknesses. One could not wish the thing to be better done.

The object of this biographical introduction is to counter 'the usual view . . . that her work suffered from both [the conversion from Christianity and the union with Lewes] because both caused her lasting distress of mind and therefore

accentuated her preoccupation with moral questions, to the detriment of her creative power'. It is odd, to-day, to realize how many people have thought the earlier novels superior to the later ones (a view held, if one can judge from the bookshops, by present-day publishers). Edmund Gosse, not so long ago, could write: '*Middlemarch* is constructed with unfailing power, and the picture of commonplace English country life which it gives is vivacious after a mechanical fashion, but all the charm of the earlier stories has evaporated, and has left behind it merely a residuum of unimaginative satire'—echoing Leslie Stephen's judgement that 'The immediate success of *Middlemarch* may have been proportioned rather to its author's reputation than to its intrinsic merits'. It was Stephen's daughter who did as much as anyone to make amends, and one would have thought that the quality of *Middlemarch* was by now generally recognized; but perhaps Mrs. Bennett is justified in referring to Gosse's as 'the usual view', though one hopes not.

What is more doubtful and (as far as critical method goes) more important is whether Mrs. Bennett's biographical section—for all its interest and wise judgement—really gives, or *can* give, the answer to Gosse's view. Surely the only answer must lie in the books themselves? Is it not more satisfactory to use biographical material to confirm and explain judgements already reached rather than to lead off with a biographical account? It is not as though the biographical information were a necessary elucidation of the novels. Doubtless there is a connexion between a writer's ability to solve his personal and his artistic problems, but nobody who considers *Middlemarch* 'unimaginative satire' is likely to be converted by the proof that George Eliot was not, after all, obsessed with a sense of personal moral guilt.

And it is precisely on the novels themselves that Mrs. Bennett is least illuminating. With her overall judgements few will quarrel. *Middlemarch* is seen as the masterpiece, and the positive qualities, not only of the earlier books, but of *Felix Holt* and *Deronda* are brought out. Perhaps it is idiosyncratic to object to her comparatively high (though not uncritical) rating of *Adam Bede*; but is this novel not a good deal nearer the conventional Victorian best-seller (and, ultimately, Mrs. Henry Wood) than is generally admitted? More fundamental is the question of the *kind* of analysis Mrs. Bennett brings to the books. This is often far from satisfactory. Surely the important question about Ladislaw, for instance, is not whether he is good enough for Dorothea, but whether he is realized by George Eliot with the same conviction and lack of wishful-thought as most of the characters in *Middlemarch*. (This is not just a question about a detail in a particular novel but about basic critical method.) To say that 'Certainly George Eliot did not intend us to share Sir James Cheetham's view that their [Dorothea's and Ladislaw's] marriage was a disaster' is to beg the question, just as is the comment on the scene of Milly's death in *Amos Barton*: 'If Victorian mothers really staged such theatrical death-bed scenes their notion of the seemingly has dated.' One is conscious that one is doing Mrs. Bennett less than justice by quoting single sentences; the sentence about *Amos Barton*, for example, is followed by an excellent analysis of the language of the scene which is very much to the point.

An interesting book? Yes, indeed. And yet (because the subject is important

and the critic distinguished) it must be said that, for all its qualities, it is not a truly satisfying book about a considerable novelist, that it does not penetrate to the depth of her quality, nor satisfactorily analyse, from a consistent critical standpoint, her failures. It is not hard to find here points with which one agrees, moments of insight, things well said. But the heart of the matter? Scarcely.

A. C. KETTLE

The Notebooks of Henry James. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary by F. O. MATTHIESSEN and KENNETH B. MURDOCK. Pp. xxviii+425. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948. 30s. net.

The Art of Fiction and other Essays by Henry James. With an Introduction by MORRIS ROBERTS. Pp. xxiv+240. New York: Oxford University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948. 15s. net.

Harvard University Library possesses nine notebooks kept by Henry James between 1878 and 1911. When he began the first he had published two novels, *Roderick Hudson* (1876) and *The American* (1877); the last ends eight years after the publication of *The Ambassadors*. The editors have transcribed these notebooks, given a running commentary which indicates the relationship of the notes to the published works and to relevant facts in James's life, and added the 'scenario' for *The Ambassadors*, a 'Note' for an unfinished novel, 'the K.B. case', and the 'First Statement' of *The Sense of the Past*. While the editors rightly speak of James's 'working notebooks', it may perhaps be questioned whether they were right to treat all their material as though it were of the same kind. They observe that three notebooks differ in character from the rest. Each of them contains comments on James's past life or his impressions of the scenes around him in America or in London. They overlap in time with the other notebooks, so that to maintain the strict chronological arrangement they desired the editors have been unable to print each notebook as it stands. Material has had to be transposed. One of these three, which the editors call 'Notebook VII' was in fact called by James 'Journal III'. And Mr. Sidney E. Lind in an extremely interesting letter to *T.L.S.* (27 Nov. 1948) has argued that the editors have in fact confused two kinds of material which James deliberately kept separate; that James attached quite specific and separate meanings to the words 'Notebook' and 'Journal'; that what we in fact have are six working notebooks and three volumes of 'Journal' in which James records day to day experience. The question may perhaps remain open; but notice should be taken of Mr. Lind's letter, which is, on the face of it, quite convincing. Certainly most readers must I think feel a certain awkwardness in passing (pp. 330, 332) from the 'Journal' record to the 'Notebook' record: the difference of intention—and intensity—is very marked.

Most of James's enormous *œuvre* lies between the first notebook and the last. But in what sense? What are the notebooks about? This seems to be the first question to ask, and one to which one may try to sketch an answer. For some readers misled by their expectations and perhaps because they have confused in their own minds a notebook with a diary have, it would seem, been disappointed

by this volume. What we get here is indeed not something entirely new but rather a confirmation and substantiation of what we knew already—and an experience; for to read *The Notebooks* is to be curiously moved.

In an early essay on 'The Art of Fiction' republished by Mr. Roberts,¹ James wrote:

Experience is never limited, and it is never complete; it is an immense sensibility, a kind of huge spider web of the finest silken threads suspended in the chamber of consciousness, and catching every air-borne particle in its tissue. It is the very atmosphere of the mind; and when the mind is imaginative—much more when it happens to be that of a man of genius—it takes to itself the faintest hints of life, it converts the very pulses of the air into revelations.

In reading these notebooks, which are simply the partial record of how a novelist of genius prepared his novels and short stories, this is the first sight we see: the particles caught, the pulses of the air turned into revelations. We see the whispers of many *salons*, the anecdotes told by a thousand ladies at a thousand dinner tables caught, plunged into this extraordinary sensibility, transformed, sometimes only after a lapse of many years. There was the story of the child 'divided' between divorced parents, the story of how a mother and her son quarrelled over the contents of a house, the story of the few words spoken by an old famous man to a young American in a Paris house. . . . I have mentioned these eminent cases because we already knew from the Prefaces that *What Maisie Knew*, *The Spoils of Poynton* and the great structure of *The Ambassadors* grew from such seeds. What is startling is not that this should have happened—but the scale on which it happened, the grandiose scale of this 'receiving'. 'Try to be one of those people on whom nothing is lost' James advised the young writer in the essay already quoted. He spoke of himself. And his sense of the richness of the possibilities that await him, of the treasures that lie stored up only waiting for him to grasp them is conveyed with strange power in those altogether remarkable invocations to his muse, or to his particular *daimon*, which from time to time burst through the patient labour of his annotations and explorations.

The 'idea' conveyed in a suggested situation—this was what mostly started James off, it appears. He observes that Turgénieff began by envisaging a group of characters. And though, knowing as he did that 'Character in any sense we can get at it, is action, and action is plot', he was too sensible to be drawn into the plot-character controversy—he has some good remarks on it in the essay on Trollope—yet he himself rarely began like this (*Portrait of a Lady* was perhaps a notable exception). 'The great question of *subject* surges in grey dimness about me. It is everything—it is everything.' The subject presents itself to him first as situation—the situations that he fishes out of the stream of gossip. The situation may seem nothing. Its context, the context it was related to, may be discarded. The subject is not there, in 'real life', in the vague melting flux. James was never taken in by the 'slice of life' theory: let the slice be what

¹ Along with the essays on Balzac, Trollope, de Maupassant, Turgénieff, Flaubert, Zola, 'The New Novel', 'Criticism', and Emerson. It must be admitted that one reads these essays principally for the light they throw on James and his ideas.

it will it has been 'tainted by the hard liability to form' (his remarks in the essay on 'The New Novel', of which this is one, say all that is needed about this tedious question). The situation has only possibilities and does not exist until these have been worked out. Any situation is the result of action. It must be 'seen' as involving actions, choices, decisions, as constituting the 'form' (or, if the word is preferred, 'correlative') of choices and actions. The 'seeing', the finding of the subject is the grand theme of this book, which might have been called 'The Art of Reflection':

I have two things in mind, and the best thing is for me to thresh them out a little here. It all comes back to the old old lesson—that of the art of *reflection*. When I practice it the whole field is lighted up—I feel again the multitudinous presence of all human situations and pictures, the surge and pressure of life. All passions, all combinations are there.

The process of reflection means 'ciphering out' the situation, 'extracting' the subject from it; it means asking many questions: what combinations of passions can have led up to it? what can follow it? (And sometimes the situation buckles under him—it cannot hold enough.) And with what patience James asks his questions, what concentration, with what close logic! And with what fertility of suggestion—'It gives and gives; everything seems to give and give as I artfully press. And what pressure of mine isn't artful?—by the divine diabolical law under which I labour.' We can watch all this happening most fully in the notes for *The Spoils of Poynton* and *What Maisie Knew*, but almost every page yields an instance, large or small.

Elucidation of subject means elucidation of form: form is the story which carries the subject. They cannot be separated out, for

This sense of the story being the idea, the starting point, of the novel, is the only one that I can see in which it can be spoken of as something different from its organic whole; and since in proportion as the work is successful the idea permeates and penetrates it, informs and animates it, so that every word and every punctuation point contribute directly to the expression, in that proportion do we lose our sense of the story as being a blade which may be drawn more or less out of its sheath.¹

Story is both *what* is told and *how* it is told. The way of telling that James valued most highly was the dramatic: naturally enough as his interest was more and more in the situation, the moment of decision. And what he learned from his attempts to practice drama was precious to him; this is one of the strong threads in the *Notebooks*. What he learned was the necessary counterpart to the immense fertility of which he was conscious. He learned 'the art of fundamental statement', the art of clarifying the subject to the last hairsbreadth. These are the two master themes of the *Notebooks*: the art of reflection, and the art of fundamental statement. This second finds its complete expression in the 'divine principle of the *scenario*', the detailed draft of the novel. The synopsis of *The Ambassadors* submitted to Harpers is the completest example of the scenario, with all the traces of working removed. This second art, without which all the

¹ From *The Art of Fiction*.

richness of suggestion, all the abundance of possibilities would have spoiled and wasted, he was learning to the end, and it was the thought of this that moved him to a last astonishing call to the *daimon*:

I come back, I come back, yet again and again, to my only seeing it in the dramatic way—as I can only see everything and anything now . . . I come back, I come back, as I say, I all throbbingly and yearningly and passionately, oh, *mon bon*, come back to this way that is clearly the only one in which I can do anything now, and that will open out to me more and more and that has overwhelming reasons pleading all beautifully in its breast. What really happens is that the closer I get to the problem of the application of it in any particular case, the more I get into that application, so the doubts and torments fall away from me, the more I know where I am, the more everything spreads and shines and draws me on and I'm justified of my logic and my passion.

'Simply a question', someone might say, 'of knowing what one wants to do and putting a plan down on paper.' And indeed that is all.

Only within limits can these *Notebooks* help us to understand any work by James. 'A man on whom nothing is lost' is after all only a partly true description of the novelist or any other artist. He can only see what he is capable of seeing. What he is capable of seeing depends on what he is. And what James was we see only in part from this record. We do not see why these particular air-blown suggestions stirred him, why out of all the possible subjects he chose precisely these. The pressures that drove to the choice are not displayed. What we are watching is the process of creation when the subject has been 'objectified', when the umbilical cord that tied it to the artist has been cut and it seems to exist in its own right. We see the process as in the light of day, rational, discursive. And the process we are watching operates indifferently. The great subject and the trivial may loom equally large. We cannot estimate from these notes the amount of 'felt life' that the projected construction will carry, because the very nature of the record precludes it. Feeling and tone are not recorded. The 'subject' is only partially defined in these pages; as a record of intentions this is only partial. We can state it thus: 'Given such and such experiences such a situation can be relevant in this or this way: how is the situation to be arranged so that its relevance can be complete?' What we see is the arrangement, never the full relevance. Thus the *Notebooks* do not explain the works. On the contrary the works are needed to explain the *Notebooks*. Why James chose this and not that, why he arranged in this way and not in that—such questions can only be answered from knowledge of the complete intention. Only the work gives this.

What moves, and what astonishes, what makes the reading of the *Notebooks* so strange an experience, is the immensity of this record of 'patience and passion and piety'; what can frighten is the absorption, the logic, the detachment. It is the pure and unmixed, the inhuman absorption and detachment of the artist or the saint. This is no 'manual of the art of fiction' though it has been hailed as such. The aspiring novelist is more likely to be terrified than instructed. He might learn to keep a notebook . . . for the rest he must do what he can. In a note that was the basis of *The Middle Years* James imagined an ageing artist or man of letters conscious now at the end of his life that only now has he mastered

his art, and desperately wishing for time to do the real great thing he knows he can do. He dreams he has had his chance—"Then his waking to find that what he has dreamed of is only what he has *done*." For 'We work in the dark—we do what we can—we give what we have' and 'our doubt is our passion and our passion is our task. The rest is the madness of art.'

D. J. GORDON

Taste & Technique in Book-Collecting. By JOHN CARTER. Pp. xi+201. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. 15s. net.

The University of Cambridge has exercised a commendably catholic choice in its appointments of Sandars Readers in Bibliography. In the past, distinguished authorities have lectured on manuscripts, typography (ancient and modern), book-collectors, and book-bindings. Now Mr. John Carter, Sandars Reader in 1947, comes forward as an authority on book-collecting speaking not as a bibliographer or a collector, but as a professional dealer. He disclaims any intention of speaking as a man of letters, but his lectures are cast in such an attractive form that he has certainly the requisite qualifications. The style of *Taste and Technique in Book-collecting* deserves mention because many recent contributions to bibliography are so technical and concerned with the mechanics of the subject that they cannot be read with any degree of pleasure.

In speaking of the reaction of the bookseller on the collector Mr. Carter states that 'at all times collectors' technique certainly, and taste often, has been influenced by the booksellers with whom they deal', a point which is illustrated by the assistance given by F. S. Ellis in the compilation of the Huth Catalogue. Pickering also in the first half of the nineteenth century had considerable influence in directing the attention of collectors to the 'moderns' of those days—Keats, Shelley, Lamb, and Byron. In our own time Elkin Mathews's catalogue of Johnson and Johnsoniana revived interest in that particular field and stimulated those Johnsonian studies which have become so numerous in recent years.

Among the names of the imposing parade of collectors displayed are those of Buxton Forman, whose *Shelley Library* was 'a prototype as well as a portent'; Henry Huth, whose catalogue set a new standard of book-description; H. W. Miller, whose library at Britwell represented the greatest nineteenth-century collection of rare early English books; and Thomas J. Wise, whose most important contribution to the technique of collecting was insistence on original condition. From overseas we have the names of H. C. Folger, J. Pierpont Morgan, Henry E. Huntington, and Carl H. Pforzheimer. Mr. Carter offers to the uninitiated some justification for the presence of eighty-odd copies of the *First Folio* in the Folger Library and of fifty or so copies of the first edition of *Paradise Lost* in the University Library of Illinois.

On the practical side Mr. Carter's book will be of great value. Most collectors and librarians will be grateful for distinctions in rarity—absolute, relative, temporary, and localized; for the assessment of 'condition'; and what constitutes 'original condition'.

Mr. Carter's views on the education of the collector are interesting. In America this appears to be one of the functions of a University librarian who, in addition

to his routine duties, seeks to cultivate among the alumni an intelligent interest in the rare-book room. While not expressing a definite opinion on this policy one would agree that 'many English collectors would benefit, especially in youth, from a rather warmer shoulder from academic and official bodies and persons than they commonly encounter'. Mr. Carter perhaps underrates the efforts of librarians in what he calls the exploitation of special collections in University libraries. In the field of English studies the Bodleian arranged the most extensive exhibition in this country to commemorate the tercentenary of the death of Shakespeare, and a similar exhibition in 1934 to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the death of Samuel Johnson. In the last decade a continuous sequence of special exhibitions was arranged, many of them bearing on English literature.

Most persons have to rely on libraries for book-rarities, and here Mr. Carter raises a question often in the minds of the custodians of *rariora*. Dr. Chapman rightly says that the 'student should have some access to originals . . . for practical purposes and . . . also for his spiritual health', but this raises the question of what amount of use in the case of valuable books in the original parts or bound in flimsy boards with paper labels can be permitted. Librarians will become more cautious than ever when they read that it costs a book-collector 'five pounds every time he reads his first edition of *Lamia* (1820) in boards'. As the young student cannot be expected to obtain any sound bibliographical knowledge of rare books without preliminary training, there is much to be said for the formation of collections of bibliographical specimens such as Dr. John Johnson and others have helped the University to bring together in the collections at the Oxford University Press.

STRICKLAND GIBSON

SHORT NOTICES

Letters of Catharine, Countess of Suffolk. Part I. Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian Society (part of Vol. 47). Kendal, 1948.

The manuscripts at Levens Hall near Kendal were examined by the Historical Manuscripts Commission. But their Report had hardly anything to say about the eighteenth-century papers, which are of considerable interest. The instalment under notice is probably the gem of that part of the archives. Catharine Grahame, who inherited Levens from her father, married in 1708 her cousin Henry Howard, fourth Earl of Berkshire, who later became eleventh Earl of Suffolk. She never saw Levens again, and her letters are mostly written from Charleton in Wiltshire. But her affectionate interest in the place and its people, as well as her firm grasp of her rights, inform her correspondence with her steward Martyr. The instalment now edited by Mrs. Bagot (wife of the owner of Levens) is limited to Lady Suffolk's letters to Martyr; but 'Part I' suggests the publication of his letters, of which the good man kept copies. Martyr's virtues shine the more conspicuous because he succeeded an unjust steward.

Unlike her husband, Lady Suffolk was by no means illiterate, and her letters give perfect expression to her dogmatic and formidable, but not unkindly, personality. A fine specimen of the aristocratic idiom, and a good picture of their age and class.

R. W. CHAPMAN

Jacob Tonson In Ten Letters By and About Him. Edited with Introductory Essay and Notes by SARAH L. C. CLAPP. Pp. 32. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1948. [No price given.]

This brochure is of interest. Five of the letters are at Texas, four are in the British Museum, and one in the Folger Shakespeare Library. There are books on Curll and Dodsley, but beyond a thesis by G. F. Papali in the library of London University, nothing of any length, so far as I know, has been written on Jacob Tonson. This is a pity as it was largely owing to Tonson's enterprise and ability that publishing in its modern sense became established, and the author became less dependent than he had been on the patron. The personality of Tonson has survived because of his long association with Dryden. He was also Secretary to the Kit-Cat Club. But every additional piece of information is of value. These ten letters are here given in full. Six are by Tonson himself; and all ten belong to the period of his retirement near Ledbury. Part of the first, dated 'Aprill the 22nd 1728' was printed in this *Review* (April 1925), because it showed that Tonson himself wrote some verses, which had been attributed to Dryden and Waller, printed before the second edition of Creech's *Lucretius* (1683). Tonson was an old man at the time of the letters, and they are concerned a good deal with his reading, his wine, his food, and other such matters. Three of them are from Dr. William Oliver (of biscuit fame) and one from Samuel Croxall. Both writers give some account of Tonson: the physician was anything but pleased with Tonson's failure to attend to personal cleanliness. Tonson's mixture of generosity and parsimoniousness, which is clear from his relations with Dryden, are shown in these letters about him. We learn from the letters of Jacob senior to his nephew, Jacob junior, that the great publisher continued to be interested in his trade, and we get glimpses of his astuteness in business. When urging the publication of the 5th edition of Congreve's *Works* he writes: 'but the Sooner the better, Let a mans worth be neavour soe great after Death it gets strangely out of the minds of his Surviving acquaintance. If mr Addisons works were now to bee published there would not, I beleive, be the same number of Subscribers.' Now that Tonson had leisure to read his firm's books, he was quick at spotting mistakes in the texts: he points out an error in the 1721 edition of Dryden's *Virgil*. Miss Clapp has written a short but excellent introduction and has supplied some necessary notes.

HUGH MACDONALD

Five Essays Written in French. By EMILY JANE BRONTË. Translated by LORINE WHITE NAGEL, with an Introduction and Notes by FANNIE E. RATCHFORD. Pp. viii+19. El Paso, Texas; Hertzog, for the University of Texas Press, 1948. [No price given.]

It is doubtful whether the five essays written in French by Emily Brontë in Madame Héger's school in Brussels fulfil all the claims made in the introduction to this new translation. It is true that there are reminiscences of Emily's poetry in these essays, but the thought of the essays rarely attains the philosophical level of the poetry. 'The Cat' shows a little of the human compassion of the poetry, 'The Portrait of King Harold' a glimpse of the passionate desire for absolute freedom, 'Filial Love' a touch of the understanding of divine nature, 'A Letter' a shadow of the stormy relations of *Wuthering Heights*, and 'The Butterfly' a trace of Emily's firm belief in God; but, on the whole, if a search is being made for Emily herself and her philosophy the essays have little to say which the poetry does not say better. In all the essays the language is clear and simple, perhaps, as the translator conveys, owing to Emily's own linguistic limitations during the early period of her stay in Brussels. The notes to the text are always adequate, for the greater part of the work explains itself. The essays may demand some attention as an introduction to the work of Emily Brontë but they offer nothing more than a brief, though pleasing, acquaintance.

RUTH CHRISTIAN

The Prosodic Theory of Gerard Manley Hopkins. By Sister M. M. HOLLOWAY. Pp. 121. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947. No price given.

Sister Holloway seems to be trying to fit together pieces of a jigsaw puzzle of her own invention that refuse to make a pattern. Her dissertation, after three readings at wide intervals, is to this reader a perplexing and ineffectual groping in the dark. She regrets that 'Hopkins's reputation as a prosodist was from the beginning intimately related to and almost inextricably entangled with his poetic reputation'. (What else could she expect since she is dealing with a poet?) She attempts, therefore, to discover the prosodist pure, establish his reputation, and present his theories 'in their totality'. To do this she picks out for comment the usual well-known texts—his early essays particularly 'On the Origin of Beauty: a Platonic Dialogue', remarks in the *Note-Books*, comments in his *Letters*, lecture notes on Rhetoric, and his *Preface*. Undergraduate work is treated with as much reverence as ripe comment in the interests of the 'total pattern'. Five chapters make up this pamphlet—Structure; Stress and Rhythm; the 'Foot'; Metre and 'Sprung Rhythm'; Time and Measure; and the Preface to the *Poems*. In them the writer 'runs through' the material mentioned above, in desultory fashion, without illuminating it or impressing any shape upon the comment, leaving the reader bewildered to know where she is going and what she is trying to do. Perhaps the reason for this lack of fundamental clarity is to be found in an early footnote where we are referred to an article by Dr. J. C. La Drière called 'Prosody', and filling six pages in a *Dictionary of World Literature*. We are told that 'the system outlined in that article has been used throughout this study as a background against which to interpret Hopkins's theories'.

C. COLLEER ABBOTT

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By A. MACDONALD

DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL

Vol. 42, No. 1, December 1949

Eleanor of Aquitaine and the Arthurian romances (Mary Williams), pp. 1-7.

ELH

Vol. 16, No. 3, September 1949

Cantus Troili (Ernest H. Wilkins), pp. 167-73.

[*Tr. & Cris.* 1. 400-20.]

The route of Chaucer's first journey to Italy (George B. Parks), pp. 174-87.

Geoffrey Chaucer, Esq., and Sir John Hawkwood (Robert Armstrong Pratt), pp. 188-93.

Nature and grace in *The Faerie Queene* (A. S. P. Woodhouse), pp. 194-228.

Explication de texte applied to Walt Whitman's poem 'Out of the cradle endlessly rocking' (Leo Spitzer), pp. 229-49.

Vol. 16, No. 4, December 1949

Johnson on a free Press: a study in liberty and subordination (Edward A. Bloom), pp. 251-71.

Colonel Maclean and the Junius controversy (Francesco Cordasco), pp. 272-83.

Recurrent words in *The Prelude* (Ellen Douglass Leyburn), pp. 284-98.

Sandals more interwoven and complete: a re-examination of the Keatsian odes (Thomas E. Connolly), pp. 299-307.

Henry James's rejection of *The Sacred Fount* (Claire J. Raeth), pp. 308-24.

ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. 30, No. 6, December 1949

Yeats's Mask (A. Norman Jeffares), pp. 289-96.

On identifying and classifying sentences (P. A. Erades), pp. 299-308.

Points of modern English syntax (P. A. Erades), pp. 317-20.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. 64, No. 7, November 1949

To get/be invited (Anna Granville Hatcher), pp. 433-46.

Middle-English poems by Mydwynter (R. H. Bowers), pp. 454-61.

A quaint conceit from Guarini to Dryden (Chandler B. Beall), pp. 461-8.

[Use of 'die' in sexual sense.]

John Donne and the Tower of Babel (Don Cameron Allen), pp. 481-3.

Vol. 64, No. 8, December 1949

The sources of *The Double Marriage* by Fletcher and Massinger (Warren Smith), pp. 505-13.

The pedant and church in *Twelfth Night*, III. ii. 80 (R. C. Simonini, Jr.), pp. 513-15.

Pompey as the mythical lover of Cleopatra (Waino S. Nyland), pp. 515-16.

Thomas Dekker, Robert Wilson, and *The Shoemakers Holiday* (Fredson Bowers), pp. 517-19.

The body as a triangular structure in Spenser and Chapman (Richard H. Perkinson), pp. 520-2.

Daniel Skinner, Lord Preston, and Milton's *Commonplace Book* (Maurice Kelley), pp. 522-5.

Milton's 'Aerie Microscope' (Kester Svendsen), pp. 525-7.

[P.R. iv. 40-2, 55-60.]

Milton and Lee's *The Rival Queens* (1677) (G. Blakemore Evans), pp. 527-8.

A note on the date of a Dryden letter (Henry Hitch Adams), pp. 528-31.

Some linguistic studies of 1945-1948 (Kemp Malone), pp. 532-73.

Vol. 65, No. 1, January 1950

The form and content of the *Notbrowne Mayde* (Arthur K. Moore), pp. 11-16.

Shakespeare and Thomas Morley (John H. Long), pp. 17-22.

Tennyson: revision of *In Memoriam*, section 85 (Mary Joan Ellmann), pp. 22-30.

An English mystery play fragment ante 1300 (Rossell Hope Robbins), pp. 30-5.

Plotinus and Arnold's 'Quiet Work' (Fraser Neiman), pp. 52-5.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. 64, No. 3, July 1949

John Donne and the Countess of Bedford (P. Thomson), pp. 329-40.

- John Stuart Mill's visit to Wordsworth, 1831 (Anna J. Mill), pp. 341-50.
 Early English translations of Goethe's essays on Byron (John Hennig), pp. 360-71.
 Double time in *Romeo and Juliet* (Raymond Chapman), pp. 372-4.

NEOPHILOLOGUS

31ste Jaarg., Afl. 4, 1 October 1949

- Falstaff's Bardolph (Charles L. Draper), pp. 222-6.
 Polychronica (J. Swart), pp. 227-33.
 [English translations of Higden.]

NOTES AND QUERIES

Vol. 194, No. 24, 26 November 1949

- Additions for 'O.E.D.' (M. A. Shaaber), pp. 508-9.
 [From seventeenth- and eighteenth-century farces.]
 The validity of the Baines document (Lynette and Eveline Feasey), pp. 514-17.
 Thomas Chudleigh on John Locke, 1684 (Cecil Price), p. 519.
 English visitors in Switzerland (G. R. de Beer), pp. 519-20.
 [See N. & Q. cxiv. 426-7; continued 24 December, pp. 556-7.]
 A MS. fragment of Hume's *Treatise*, 1740 (Ernest C. Mossner), pp. 520-2.
 Weever, Ovid and Shakespeare (A. D.), pp. 524-5.
 [See N. & Q. cxiv. 333-4.]

Vol. 194, No. 25, 10 December 1949

- Mak, Op-Signorken, and Mr. Hardwick (Robert Withington), pp. 530-1.
 [Parallels with the *Secunda Pastorum*.]
 A 'Faustus' ballad (F. N. Lees), p. 534.
 Chapman's *All Fools* (S. Y. E.), p. 534.
 [See N. & Q. cxiv. 19.]
Hamlet 1. i. 60-3 (H. W. Jones), p. 535.
 'Ingratitude' and the 'Monster' image (Murray Abend), pp. 535-6.
 [In Shakespeare.]
 Links with Shakespeare IV (H. A. Shield), pp. 536-7.
 'At any odd hour the Italian tongue' (Lowell W. Coolidge), p. 537.
 [Commentary on statement by Milton.]
 'Puffs, powders, patches, Bibles, billet-doux' (Mildred Riling), pp. 537-8.
 [In *The Rape of the Lock*.]
 Johnson's definition of 'Network' (D. J. Greene), pp. 538-9.
 Contributors to *Blackwood's Magazine* (A. L. Strout), pp. 541-3.
 Thomas Paine silenced (Francesco Cordasco), pp. 544-5.
 An Arthur Symons annotation (Charles Duffy), p. 545.

Vol. 194, No. 26, 24 December 1949

- A Chaucer allusion of 1598 (E. D. Mackerness), p. 554.
 Possible echoes from Sidney's *Arcadia* in Shakespeare, Milton and others (A. D.), pp. 554-5.

Shakspere and the scholars (Abraham Feldman), p. 556.

'Rope-Tricks' (J. C. Maxwell), p. 556.

[*The Taming of the Shrew*, i. ii. 113.]

Two notes on Smollett (Francesco Cordasco), pp. 557-8.

Keats and Smollett (David Bonnell Green), pp. 558-9.

A minor character in Fanny Burney's *Diary* identified (T. S. Blakeney), p. 559.

Lamb's parallel between the Prince Regent and King Belshazzar (John M. Turnbull), pp. 559-60.

William Tyler (Noel Scott), pp. 560-1.

[Author of *Woodland Echoes*, 1824.]

An early draft of 'The Cry of the Children' (Hazel Harrod), pp. 564-6.

[E. B. Browning.]

Two letters of John Bright (Frederick B. Tolles), pp. 566-8.

Vol. 195, No. 1, 7 January 1950

The inimitable Bobadil (J. D. Aylward), pp. 2-4.

Marlowe and the homilies (Lynette and Eveline Feasey), pp. 7-10.

The name of the Arabian King in Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* (J. Y. Liu), p. 10.

Some patristic sources for Milton's 'Gehenna' (Alfred L. Kellogg), pp. 10-13.

A monody on the death of Junius (Francesco Cordasco), pp. 13-14.

Additional Keats markings in *The Rogue* (David Bonnell Green), pp. 15-16.

The death of Peter Hausted (Paul Elmen), pp. 16-17.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. 28, No. 3, July 1949

English literature, 1660-1800: a current bibliography (Arthur Friedman and Louis A. Landa), pp. 360-412.

Steele's unassigned tract against the Earl of Oxford (John Robert Moore), pp. 413-18.

Fielding's epilogue for Theobald (Charles B. Woods), pp. 419-24.

The text of Johnson's *Shakespeare* (1765) (G. Blakemore Evans), pp. 425-8.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Vol. 64, No. 4, September 1949

The truth about Candida (Arthur H. Nethercot), pp. 639-47.

[In Shaw's play.]

Wycherley and Calderón: a source for *Love in a Wood* (James Urvin Rundle), pp. 701-7.

Milton on Learning and Wisdom (Irene Samuel), pp. 708-23.

The Stoic *Consolatio* and Shakespeare (Benjamin Boyce), pp. 771-80.

Robert Greene and *John of Bordeaux* (Waldo F. McNeir), pp. 781-801.

The Roman rite in Bale's *King John* (Edwin Shepard Miller), pp. 802-22.

Chaucer's pilgrims (J. R. Hulbert), pp. 823-8.

The conundrums in Saxo's Hamlet episode (Hans Sperber), pp. 864-70.

The Old English storm riddles (Erika von Erhardt-Siebold), pp. 884-8.

The legend of Julius Caesar's British conquest (Homer Nearing, Jr.), pp. 889-929.

Vol. 64, No. 5, December 1949

Conrad's changes in narrative conception in the manuscripts of *Typhoon* and *Other Stories* and *Victory* (H. T. Webster), pp. 953-62.

Serialization and *Evan Harrington* (Royal A. Gettmann), pp. 963-75.

Lord Byron and Count Alborghetti (Leslie A. Marchand), pp. 976-1007.

Behind Steele's satire on undertakers (Robert A. Aubin), pp. 1008-26.

The historical setting of Milton's *Observations* on the *Articles of Peace*, 1649 (Merritt Y. Hughes), pp. 1049-73.

Robert Burton's frontispiece (William R. Mueller), pp. 1074-88.

The reporter of *Henry VI, Part 2* (John E. Jordan), pp. 1089-1113.

The fifteenth-century editors of the *Canterbury Tales* and the problem of tale order (Germaine Dempster), pp. 1123-42.

Notes on some interrelations between the Latin and English texts of the *Ancrene Riwe* (Charlotte D'Evelyn), pp. 1164-79.

Continental associations for the *Ancrene Riwe* (John H. Fisher), pp. 1180-9.

Readings from the Thorkelin transcripts of *Beowulf* (Kemp Malone), pp. 1190-1218.

The French originals of Rossetti's *John of Tours* and *My Father's Close* (Cecil Yelverton Lang), pp. 1219-22.

The lily and the rose: symbolic meaning in Tennyson's *Maud* (E. D. H. Johnson), pp. 1222-7.

Arthurian names: 'Arthur' (William A. Nitze), p. 1235.

[A correction: see *P.M.L.A.* lxiv. 585-96.]

'Conception is a blessing' (Evan K. Gibson), pp. 1236-8.

[On *Hamlet*, II. ii. 181: see *P.M.L.A.* lxiv. 507-16.]

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

Vol. 46, No. 4, October 1949

Coleridge on Locke (R. Florence Brinkley), pp. 521-43.

Swift's 'Little' Harrison, poet and continuator of the *Tatler* (Robert C. Elliott), pp. 544-59.

The sources, symbolism and unity of Shelley's *Skylark* (Stewart C. Wilcox), pp. 560-76.

THE LIBRARY CHRONICLE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Vol. 3, No. 3, Summer 1949

Jacob Tonson, eminent hand (Sarah L. C. Clapp), pp. 136-45.

Byron and Elizabeth Pigot (Willis W. Pratt), pp. 146-61.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

July—December 1949

[Unless otherwise stated, the date of each publication is 1949.]

- AHLGREN, A. On the Use of the Definite Article with 'Nouns of Possession' in English. Uppsala, 1946. pp. xvi+221. 12s. 6d.
- ALLEN, D. C. The Legend of Noah. Urbana. pp. viii+221. \$3.50.
- AUBREY, J. Brief Lives. Ed. O. L. Dick. London. pp. cxiv+408. 30s.
- AULT, N. New Light on Pope. London. pp. x+379. 30s.
- BAKER, C. H. C., and MURIEL I. The Life and Circumstances of James Brydges First Duke of Chandos. Oxford. pp. xx+493. 42s.
- BLACK, R. K. The Sadleir-Black Gothic Collection. Charlottesville, Va.: Bibliographical Soc. of Univ. of Virginia. pp. 16.
- BLUNDEN, E. After the Bombing and other short poems. London. pp. viii+51. 6s.
- BORST, W. A. Lord Byron's First Pilgrimage. New Haven, 1948. pp. xxviii+179. \$3.75; 21s.
- BOWERS, F. A Supplement to the Woodward & McManaway Check List of English Plays 1641-1700. Charlottesville, Va.: Bibliographical Soc. of Univ. of Virginia. pp. 22. \$1.00.
- BOWRA, C. M. The Creative Experiment. London. pp. viii+255. 16s.
- BOYS, R. C. Sir Richard Blackmore and the Wits. Ann Arbor. pp. x+152. 14s.
- BROOKE, T. Essays on Shakespeare and other Elizabethans. London. pp. xii+220. 15s.
- BROWNING, R. Poems. Selected Sir H. Milford. London. pp. xii+720. 7s.
- BRUNNER, K. Abriss der mittellenglischen Grammatik. (2nd edn.) Halle, 1948. pp. viii+114. RM.3.80.
- CALDER, GRACE J. The Writing of *Past and Present*. New Haven. pp. xii+216. 21s.
- CAMPBELL, A. (ed.). Encomium Emmae Reginae. London. pp. lxx+108. No price given.
- CASSON, L. F. (ed.). Sir Degrevant. London. pp. lxxvii+167. 52s. 6d.
- CECIL, LORD D. Reading as One of the Fine Arts. Oxford. pp. 16. 2s.
- CLEMEN, W. Shelley's Geisterwelt. Frankfurt, 1948. pp. 72. DM.4.50.
- CLIFFORD, J. L., and L. A. LANDA (eds.) Pope and His Contemporaries. Oxford. pp. viii+278. 30s.
- COGHILL, N. The Poet Chaucer. London. pp. xii+185. 5s.
- CONKLIN, G. N. Biblical Criticism and Heresy in Milton. New York. pp. xiv+137. 14s.
- CONNELY, W. Young George Farquhar. London. pp. 349. 21s.
- COX, E. G. A Reference Guide to the Literature of Travel. Vol. III. Great Britain. Seattle. pp. xvi+732. No price given.
- DANIELSSON, B. Studies on the Accentuation of Polysyllabic Latin, Greek, and Romance Loan-Words in English. Stockholm, 1948. pp. xvi+644+6. 30s.
- DOBREE, B. The Theme of Patriotism in the Poetry of the Early Eighteenth Century. London. pp. 19. 2s. 6d.
- DOCKHORN, K. Die Rhetorik als Quelle des vorromantischen Irrationalismus in der Literatur- und Geistesgeschichte. Göttingen. pp. 109-50. DM.3.75.
- DONALDSON, E. T. Piers Plowman. The C-Text and Its Poet. New Haven. pp. xii+257. \$5.00; 27s. 6d.
- DONNA, SR. ROSE BERNARD. Despair and Hope. A Study in Langland and Augustine. Washington, D.C., 1948. pp. x+192. No price given.
- DUDLEY, F. A., and others (eds.). The Relations of Literature and Science. A Selected Bibliography 1930-1949. Pullman: State Coll. of Washington. pp. 59. \$1.00.
- EDWARDS, H. L. R. Skelton. London. pp. 325. 18s.
- FAGIN, N. B. The Histrionic Mr. Poe. Baltimore. pp. xiv+289. \$4.00.
- FAIRCHILD, H. N. Religious Trends in English Poetry. Vol. III: 1780-1830. New York. pp. xii+549. \$6.75; 35s.
- FOSTER, J. R. History of the Pre-Romantic Novel in England. New York. pp. xii+294. \$4.50.
- GRAY, SIR A. Sir Halewyn. Edinburgh. pp. viii+87. 5s.
- HALL, JOSEPH. Collected Poems. Ed. A. Davenport. Liverpool. pp. lxxvii+309. 20s.
- HANSON, L. and E. M. The Brontës. London. pp. xii+414. 25s.
- HARRIS, V. All Coherence Gone. Chicago. pp. x+255. 27s. 6d.
- HIGHET, G. The Classical Tradition. Oxford. pp. xxxviii+763. 42s.

- HILLES, F. W. (ed.). *The Age of Johnson*. New Haven. pp. xii+426. 30s.
- HOLTHAUSEN, F. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der englischen Sprache*. (3rd edn.) Göttingen. pp. viii+226. DM.12.
- HOWE, SUSANNE. *Novels of Empire*. New York. pp. viii+186. \$2.75.
- HULL, V. (ed.). *Longes Mac N-Uislenn*. New York. pp. x+187. No price given.
- HYDE, FRANZISKA. *Saxon Crown*. London. pp. 160. 5s.
- HYDE, MARY C. *Playwriting for Elizabethans 1600-1605*. New York. pp. xii+258. 25s.
- Ideas and Beliefs of the Victorians*. London. pp. 448. 21s.
- JAGGER, J. H. (ed.). *The Poet's Progress*. London. pp. xxxii+624. 7s. 6d.
- JAMES, D. G. *The Life of Reason*. London. pp. xiv+272. 18s.
- JUNGANDREAS, W. *Geschichte der deutschen und der englischen Sprache*. 2 parts. Göttingen, 1946, 1947. pp. 116; 130. DM.80; 6.20.
- KARLGREN, B. *The Chinese Language*. New York. pp. vi+112. \$3.50.
- KROUSE, F. M. *Milton's Samson and the Christian Tradition*. Princeton. pp. xii+159. \$3.75; 21s.
- KRUTCH, J. W. *Comedy and Conscience after the Restoration*. Revised edn. New York. pp. xii+300. \$3.75; 21s.
- LANDOR, W. S. *To the Burgesses of Warwick*. Oxford. pp. xiv+8. 7s. 6d.
- LEISHMAN, J. B. (ed.). *The Three Parnassus Plays (1598-1601)*. London. pp. viii+398. 42s.
- LLOYD-JONES, J. *The Court Poets of the Welsh Princes*. London. pp. 31. 5s.
- LOOMIS, R. S. *Arthurian Tradition and Chrétien de Troyes*. New York. pp. xiv+503. 42s.
- MCGINN, D. J. *The Admonition Controversy*. New Brunswick. pp. xii+589. \$6.50.
- MAGNUS, SIR P. (ed.). *English Studies 1949*. London. pp. iv+90. 8s. 6d.
- MALONE, K. *The Text of Beowulf*. [Offprint.] *Proc. Amer. Philosoph. Soc.*, xciii. 239-43.
- MERTON, E. S. *Science and Imagination in Sir Thomas Browne*. New York. pp. x+156. 14s.
- MOORE, W. G. *Molière. A New Criticism*. Oxford. pp. 136. 8s. 6d.
- MORGAN, B. Q., and A. R. HOHLFELD (eds.). *German Literature in British Magazines 1750-1860*. Madison, Wis. pp. viii+304. \$5.00.
- MURDOCK, K. B. *Literature and Theology in Colonial New England*. Cambridge, Mass. pp. xvi+235. 22s.
- OPPEL, H. *Das Shakespeare-Bild Goethes*. Mainz. pp. 118. No price given.
- PARTRIDGE, A. C. *The Problem of Henry VIII Reopened*. Cambridge. pp. 35. 5s.
- ROCHEDIEU, C. A. *Bibliography of French Translations of English Works 1700-1800*. Chicago, 1948. pp. xiv+387. 27s. 6d.
- SHAKESPEARE, W. *La Comédie des Erreurs*. Traduction de A. Koszul. Paris. pp. xxxiv+164. No price given.
- Julius Caesar. Ed. J. D. Wilson. Cambridge. pp. xlviii+219. 10s. 6d.
- SIBLEY, AGNES MARIE. *Alexander Pope's Prestige in America, 1725-1835*. New York. pp. xiv+158. 14s.
- SMART, C. *The Collected Poems*, ed. N. Callan. London. 2 vols. pp. lvi+1020. 25s.
- STAUFFER, D. A. *The Golden Nightingale*. New York. pp. vi+165. 22s. 6d.
- ŠTEPÁNK, K. *William Hazlitt jako literární kritik*. Brno, 1947. pp. 212. Kčs. 90.
- STIRLING, B. *The Populace in Shakespeare*. New York. pp. viii+203. 24s.
- STOUT, G. D. *The Political History of Leigh Hunt's Examiner*. Saint Louis. pp. x+73. \$2.50.
- TENNYSON, C. *Alfred Tennyson*. London. pp. xvi+579. 30s.
- TWAIN, MARK. *Mark Twain to Mrs. Fairbanks*. Ed. D. Wecter. San Marino, Calif. pp. xxxii+286. \$5.00.
- VINCENT, E. R. *Byron, Hobhouse and Foscolo*. Cambridge. pp. x+135. 10s. 6d.
- VISSE, F. T. *Some Causes of Verbal Obsolescence*. Utrecht. pp. 26. Fl.1.25.
- VOGEL, SR. MARY URSULA. *Some Aspects of the Horses and Rider Analogy in The Debate between the Body and the Soul*. Washington, D.C., 1948. pp. x+114. No price given.
- WEYAND, N. (ed.). *Immortal Diamond: Studies in Gerard Manley Hopkins*. London. pp. xxvi+451. 21s.
- WIELER, J. W. *George Chapman. The Effect of Stoicism upon his Tragedies*. New York. pp. xii+218. 22s.
- WILLEY, B. *Richard Crashaw (1612/13-1649)*. Cambridge. pp. 26. 1s. 6d.
- WORDSWORTH, W. *The Poetical Works*. Vol. V. Ed. E. de Selincourt and Helen Darbishire. pp. viii+498. 30s.
- WYATT, SIR T. *Collected Poems*, ed. K. Muir. London. pp. xlviii+298. 10s. 6d.
- ZEYDEL, E. H. (trans.). *The 'Tristan and Isolde' of Gottfried von Strassburg*. Princeton, 1948. pp. viii+209. 22s.

es.
ry
45.
ch
o-
7.
rs.
is.
on.
e's
ew
N.
10.
le.
te-
12.
re.
of
is.
on.
ir-
10,
nd
35.
b-
cta
he
ul.
14.
d:
ns.
he
es.
3-
ks.
ten
ed.
98.
nd
rg.